

VOLUME II

NOVEMBER, 1916.

NUMBER 5

378.05

A6

A86

cap. 2

BULLETIN

OF

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
General Announcements: Revised Program of the Annual Meeting	3
Report of Nominating Committee	8
President's Report	9
Report of Committee on University Handbook	53
Report of Committee on Pensions and Insurance	57
Nominations for Membership	81
Financial Statement	88

Gift
Photo E. C. Case
5-19-28

GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

The present issue of the BULLETIN contains various matters required to be circulated to members thirty days before the Annual Meeting, including in particular certain constitutional amendments and the report of the Nominating Committee.

The chairman of the Committee on Pensions and Insurance suggests that if the report published in this issue of the BULLETIN meets with the approval of the teaching profession generally, that fact should be ascertained at once and communicated to the trustees of the Carnegie Foundation. Two or more institutions which obtained advance information in regard to the character of the report have formally approved it, and similar action on the part of other university faculties would be helpful in case the trustees of the Foundation have not in the meantime taken definite action.

The Council has *not* adopted the proposed rule, mentioned in the October BULLETIN, requiring unanimous consent for the introduction of new resolutions at the Annual Meeting.

Nominations for Officers.—The first by-law of the association requires that blanks shall be provided upon which additional nominations by members may be made. As post-office regulations prevent enclosing a separate slip, members desiring to present such nominations are requested to do so in the following form:

I hereby nominate the following names for the offices mentioned:

President

Vice-President

Councillors

(Not to exceed ten)

.
.
.
.
.
.

Committee D—Limits of Standardization.—The chairman of this committee having become an honorary member of the Association, the Council has elected, as his successor, Prof. O. F. Long of Northwestern University.

Committee of Conference on Place of Annual Meetings.—The following committee has been appointed by the President in accordance with Council authorization (May BULLETIN, p. 9):

James H. Tufts, Philosophy, *Chairman*, University of Chicago
 J. McK. Cattell, Psychology, Columbia University
 H. P. Talbot, Chemistry, Institute of Technology
 Allyn A. Young, Economics, Cornell University
 Chester L. Jones, Political Science, University of Wisconsin
 Raymond Weeks, Modern Languages, Columbia University
 Edward A. Ross, Sociology, University of Wisconsin
 A. N. Talbot, Engineering, University of Illinois
 John A. Long, Medicine, Northwestern University School of
 Pharmacy

PROGRAM OF ANNUAL MEETING

Thursday, December 28

- 2.00 P.M. Meetings of Committees on Membership, etc.,
at Kent Hall, Columbia University.
- 3.00 P.M. Preliminary Registration, Hotel Manhattan.
- 4.00 P.M. Council Meeting, Hotel Manhattan.

Friday, December 29

- 9.00 A.M. Meetings of Committees continued. Registration at Kent Hall, Columbia University.
- 10.00 A.M.-12.00 M. *First Session, Kent Hall.*
 - 1. Adoption of Rules for Conduct of Business.
 - 2. Report of the President.
 - 3. Report of the Secretary.
 - 4. Report of the Treasurer.
 - 5. Report of the Council.
 - 6. Appointment of Committees on:
 - (a) Resolutions.
 - (b) Auditing.
 - 7. Proposals of New Business by Members, for Reference to Committee on Resolutions.
 - 8. Roll Call of Special Committees for Reports.
 - 9. Allotment of Time and Session for Debate and Action on Committee Reports.
 - 10. Inquiries by Members for Information.
 - 11. Report of Committee E, on Qualifications for Membership.
- 12.00 M.-2.00 P.M. Informal Reception and Luncheon, University Commons.
- 2.00 P.M.-5.00 P. M. *Second Session, Kent Hall.*
 - 1. Report of Committee F, on Local Chapters.
 - 2. Report of Committee N, on Handbook of American Colleges and Universities.

6 AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

3. Report of Nominating Committee and Election of Officers for the Ensuing Year.

7.00 P.M. *Annual Banquet*, Hotel Astor.*

Saturday, December 30

10.00 A.M.-12.00 M. *Third Session*, Kent Hall.

1. Report of Committee A, on Academic Freedom.
2. Report of Committee K, on Federal University at Washington.
3. Reports of other Committees having Recommendations for Action by the Meeting.

1.00-2.00 P.M. *Luncheon*, University Commons.

2.00-4.00 P.M. *Fourth Session*, Kent Hall.

1. Report of Committee on Resolutions.
2. Action on Matters Reported by the Same:
 - (a) Constitutional Amendments (other than as covered by Reports of Special Committees).
 - (b) By-law Amendments.
 - (c) Other Matters.
3. Election of New Members.
4. Report of Auditing Committee.
5. Appointment of Nominating Committee for the Ensuing Year.
6. Adjournment.

4.00 P.M. Meeting of the Council of 1917, Kent Hall.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

In Article II, paragraph I., strike out the words "or scientific productivity." This amendment is presented by the following members: G. P. Costigan, Jr., J. H. Long, Henry Schofield and J. H. Wigmore, all of Northwestern University and F. C. Woodward of the University of Chicago.

In Article VII-Dues, change "\$2.00" to "\$2.50." This amendment is presented by the following members: A. O. Lovejoy, Johns Hopkins; J. C. Rolfe, Pennsylvania; H. W.

*Advance notification requested, Harold Jacoby, Columbia University.

Tyler, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; H. C. Warren, Princeton; E. A. Ross, Wisconsin.

The Committee on Local Chapters, in its report to be published in the December BULLETIN recommends an amendment of the constitution, substantially as follows:

"Local chapters may be organized in institutions, or by regional groups of institutions, by the members of this Association for such purposes as they may determine, not inconsistent with the constitution and by-laws of the Association."

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL

Article V, Section 3 of the constitution provides that the Council shall present a written report to the Association at the Annual Meeting, sending a copy, at least one month in advance, to every member of the Association. Since the adoption of this article, the monthly BULLETIN has been established, so that Council business of general interest to members has been circulated to them. It seems, therefore, unnecessary to review the work of the year at this time further than to state that up to the present time twenty-eight formulated questions have been submitted to the Council by the officers for action, and that the details of these submissions are contained in successive issues of the BULLETIN. No meeting of the Council has been held during the year.

REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

The Nominating Committee (see May BULLETIN p. 4) presents the following recommendations for officers for 1917:

For President, Frank Thilly, Cornell University

For Vice-President, John R. Commons, University of Wisconsin

For Councillors (*for the term ending January 1, 1920*).

F. M. Anderson, Dartmouth College

F. H. Bohlen, University of Pennsylvania

M. R. Cohen, College of the City of New York

F. S. Deibler, Northwestern University

E. D. Durand, University of Minnesota

H. W. Farnam, Yale University

J. D. M. Ford, Harvard University

E. B. Greene, University of Illinois

Lucy M. Salmon, Vassar College

A. B. Wolfe, University of Texas

Signed: J. McK. Cattell, Columbia University

E. G. Conklin, Princeton University

J. W. Garner, University of Illinois

F. W. Kelsey, University of Michigan

A. W. Small (*Chairman*), University of Chicago

Nominating Committee

PRESIDENT'S REPORT FOR 1916

When the Nominating Committee, in October, 1915, notified your now President that they wished to present him as their candidate for that office, his first impulse was to protest, as Dante did to Virgil's offer,

"O Poet Guide, pray scan my worth, whether it be sufficient,
Before thou trust me with that arduous task.
Why should I be the one to go?
I am not an Aeneas, nor am I a Paul."

And the fitness of a professional man might well be doubted, especially a man of law, to act as field-marshal for the serried regiments of the humanities and the sciences. "Old Father Antick, the law!" Law is not conceived as a science as yet even by its own devotees; there is but one printed English book entitled "The Science of Law"; and not in the whole nor a part of the law is there a single -ology. Nor have the faculties of law usually shared intimately in the experiences and the problems of the faculties of liberal arts and of sciences. However, it is a good omen that the arts and sciences were willing to embrace the law among them. It is, to be sure, a reversion to type; for was not the earliest European university chiefly a law school,—and indeed the largest ever known, even to our own day?

As for your nominee himself, he had this much of circumstances tending to prepare in him a cosmopolitan sympathy toward a university congregation composite and national in scope—namely, that he was born and raised on the Pacific Coast, educated in Massachusetts, and seasoned in the Central West; and that he had visited and observed university traditions in nearly forty foreign universities and in a dozen different countries. Emboldened by this recollection to minimize the fact that he was not to the manner born, he assented to the Nominating Committee's proposal. But he warned them that they must take him in the spirit of Don Quixote's last remark to Sancho Panza, when thrusting that

modest but ignorant henchman into the Governorship of the Island; "If thou governest ill, thine will be the fault,—but the shame will be ours."

But, after all, Sancho's governership was a far different one. It had power and responsibility. The first thing that the President of this Association discovers is that he has no power. The Council virtually has it all, under the Constitution. The President cannot even appoint a Committee. (At least, he is not expressly empowered; but I advise future Presidents that they ought not to fail to assert that implied minimum of power, since there is no express denial in the Constitution.)

But reflection showed that this anomaly is, for the time being, a healthy one, for this Association. If the President had any power to act alone, he would use it. And to use it alone would be an unhealthy thing for us. A system which obliges him to submit every important proposal to two score other officers obliges *those other officers themselves to do some thinking*, and thus keeps at least that many other persons active throughout the year in the interests of the Association.

And this fact typifies the cardinal need of the Association in this its infancy, viz., to stimulate as widely as possible its consciousness of itself, its work, and its powers. Thus only can it become strong and influential. It must create, for all its members, a new and vital interest in working for its purposes. Thereby will it grow strong and become controlling, amidst our varied and distracting local interests.

Proceeding from this general principle, the policy of your President (so far as he was permitted to have one) has been, not to attempt to solve any particular problem of importance to the body of university professors, but to *develop sound methods for the life of this Association*. From the point of view of his own office, this task has been his only one.

Among these various questions of method, the following have been the most important:

- I. The working of the present Constitution in general;
- II. The operation of the Council's government;

III. The share of the members at large;

IV. The activities of the Committees.

Let these be surveyed in order:

I. The working of the present Constitution in general.—

It seems to be well adapted to our purposes. The President and the Secretary have a large amount of active work in correspondence; the President looking chiefly after the Committees, and the Secretary preparing the publications, centralizing the entire work, and overseeing the local groups and the membership at large; the Treasurer dispatching the usual tedious but vital duties of that office; and the Council voting by correspondence on all matters of more than administrative detail.

There has been no interim meeting of the Council, and only one interim meeting of the Executive Committee. All business has been transacted by correspondence, except the original selection of Committee members by the Executive Committee. This shows us that *we may and must expect to conduct our business by correspondence*. Some Associations have been ineffective by failing to recognize this, and by trying to accomplish their work at brief and expensive personal meetings. Let us recognize frankly that a national Association *can and must* transact an active business by the mails. *Most persons do not yet believe this. I want them to understand that they are looking backwards.*

II. The operation of the Council's government.—This brings me to the mode of transacting the Council's business. The parliamentary methods handed down to us presuppose a personal meeting. What remains to be developed in modern organizations is a sound system of deliberation and vote by mail, adapting the traditional methods to the newer conditions. How, for example, shall an amendment be proposed and voted upon by mail? How shall the pros and cons be debated? It is a question of devising a new method, meet for the times. The Council has made good progress, under

the Secretary's guidance, in developing such a method; its details have been set forth in our BULLETINS.

One obstacle has been the repeated failure of various members of the Council to vote on proposals submitted. Future Councillors should understand that this is a neglect of duty which endangers the success of our work.

For the reason already mentioned, I point out that our government by Council is better for us than government by a President or by an Executive Committee, even at the cost of less prompt dispatch.

The Executive Committee has proved to be decidedly the only effective organ for making the final selection of Committees. But, apart from this, the Executive Committee has little or no value. The reason is, that it has no *power*, under our Constitution. But even if it had such power, either the Council or its Executive Committee must govern,—not both; and, of the two, the former best suits our needs.

But the Council must *govern*; *i. e.* it must not abdicate its powers and defer to the membership at large by referendum. Such an abdication was once or twice proposed during the year, much to the disappointment of the President. The referendum is the easy escape of a timid popular officer from responsibility. It is the last knell of representative government. To find it seriously proposed in a body of super-educated Americans was a shock to your President. It leads to incompetent decision and nerveless direction. May it never again be thought of in this Association!

III. The share of members at large.—Here the problems of method are two: first, how to keep the membership adequately representative of our profession; and secondly, how to get the benefit of constant and healthful activity from as many members as possible.

The first problem is examined later, in dealing with the report of the Committee on Membership.

The second problem includes two others,—that of local chapters (which will be discussed on coming to the Committee on Local Chapters); and that of enlisting the help of members

in sundry Committee work, to which I now come, under the next head:

IV. The activities of the Committees.—The moral right of this Association to continue to exist depends on whether it does any work. We cannot arrogate the title "Association of University Professors" but not do the things which are calling to be done for the profession by such an association. All the problems common to university teachers and needing joint endeavors for a solution may and must be undertaken by us. It is only a question of the order in which they should be undertaken. There are now fifteen hundred of us, and there will soon be twice as many. There is work for everybody. And it is work which emphatically needs the differing experiences of various temperaments, various institutions, and various regions.

Moreover, this work does not consist merely in listening to exegetic papers and inspiring addresses, nor in exchanging ineffectual opinions. In short, it is legislative work. If this Association prepares and completes its tasks properly, its final resolutions will always be in the nature of practicable solutions of actual problems. And these solutions, sanctioned by the entire body at its annual meeting, will be carried back to the individual institutions as virtual pronouncements of national professional opinion, and will compel adoption and observance, so far as local conditions permit.

The Council, therefore, in organizing the Committees, sought to ensure three features: (1) The topics for work were to be numerous enough to permit each Committee to continue at its labors for two or three years, if needed, before finally reporting; (2) Each Committee was to be numerous enough to represent many institutions and all regions, while including as many specialists as possible; (3) The Committees were to deliberate by correspondence throughout the year, under each chairman's guidance, preparing their conclusions in shape for final action by the Association at the Annual Meeting.

The eighteen Committees and their subjects have been announced in the BULLETIN. These subjects are all promi-

nent in their demands for solution by American universities.

Without knowing what is to be the tenor of the several Committees' reports, I shall exercise the liberty here of placing my own views before the Association:

Committee A: ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE OF OFFICE.—This is a world-old theme. All through the ages runs the problem of freedom of speech. Socrates was executed for frankness of speech; he was, as he himself said, "that gadfly which God has given the State, always fastening on you, arousing and persuading and reproaching you." Those who are offended by public utterance seek to suppress those whom the spirit moves to utterance. The several interests involved give rise to distinct forms of the problem,—the freedom of one citizen to defame another, the freedom of military and civic officers to discuss the public business, the freedom of the citizen to criticise the government, the freedom of the scientist to dispute truths accepted by the multitude.

Academic freedom, then, is not a problem to be solved in a year or in ten years by this Association or by any other. Immediate Utopia cannot be hoped for. We must patiently proceed to formulate our own views of the needs of our own time, and must then endeavor to impress these views on the community at large. Our function is to build up a sound public opinion. More than this we should not and do not yet attempt to do, through this Committee.

I wish to repudiate the notion that this Association is an occupational union, which seeks to defend its members by a "We Don't Patronize" list, or by any other form of coercion. Its only means of influence is publicity, and thereby an appeal to the common sense of justice.

Publicity is the method by which our Special Committees of Inquiry gain their effect. Their primary service is to establish the facts, and then to publish them. Most of these controversies involve some serious issue of fact; and when an impartial body settles that issue, the judgment that is to be passed will usually be a unanimous one for all fair-minded persons.

That these Special Committees of Inquiry represent an impartial body, thoroughly judicial in spirit, and trustworthy in methods, must by now be obvious to all. The General Committee's rules for their method of investigation (which have not yet been published), drawn up originally by Professor Lovejoy, a member of the 1915 Committee, form an admirable system for this unique judiciary. The five Reports thus far printed are weighty documents, which would do credit to any judicial court in the world; and their findings must convince all readers that no more impartial and competent tribunal could be found for such cases.

But these inquiries made *after* the fact, which gain their effect by publicity only, may often be replaced by private inquiries, made *before* any public break, and directed to the private use of advice and conciliation for preventing a rupture. During the year, the president of a certain university telegraphed me that a serious case was impending, and that my advice given on the ground would be appreciated. I requested the chairman of the General Committee to proceed to the university for the purpose. He did so. It turned out that no genuine case of violation of academic freedom was involved; but his advice assisted all parties to reach an appropriate settlement. This seems to me the ideal way in which the services of this Association can often be used preventively. If all university authorities could show the same confidence in the function of this Association, we could more frequently illustrate the adage that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

The General Committee's report for 1915 offered some "Practical Proposals," which have been communicated to the presidents of several hundred institutions, with a request for their consideration by the boards of trustees or regents. But I point out here that those well-formulated proposals deal only with the procedural part of the subject; they do not touch what the lawyers would call the "substantive law" of the subject. That is, they formulate rules for the giving of a hearing to the professor, and for employing other measures

of fair and cautious procedure, before action upon the issue of dismissal; but they do not formulate any definition of the kind of defect or conduct which is to form just ground for dismissal. *E. g.* assuming that professional incompetence is a just ground, and that the tenor of personal professional views uttered on any subject is *not* a just ground, a main problem is to define the various classes of utterances which are not to be treated as amounting to professional incompetence. This is the most difficult part of the Committee's problem, and will continue to engage their labors.

One feature of it only must here be pointed out; and it is this: There is too much inclination (for all who discuss the subject) to forget that the prime object must be to *protect the competent and unoffending scholar* in his freedom of utterance, and that for this purpose we must *fully expect to have to bear with a few* who are obviously offensive or injudicious. We must guarantee the former's peace of mind; and must, therefore, forbear to discipline occasional instances of the latter. For the moral effect of penalties in such cases extends to the whole body of competent scholars, and tends to close their mouths for safety's sake. Most of the discussion published seems to assume that the only question can be as to the merits of the utterances of the alleged offender; and this is certainly a gross error. For a single penalty inflicted on only one in a hundred of the academic body serves as a virtual gag to the other ninety-nine, regardless of the actual demerits of the party penalized. No sound rule, therefore, can ever be devised unless it is based on the purpose of securing peace of mind for the body of unoffending scholars, and not merely on the specific desirability of suppressing this or that actual offender. The legal immunity of the judge from all civil liability for his utterances is here a powerful analogy. I have pointed out the lessons to be drawn from this analogy in an article published in the *Nation*, in December, 1916.

The place of the Committee on Academic Freedom in the work of this Association was by circumstances made so prominent in the first year of its labors that public repute gave it

an undue emphasis,—as if that Committee were uniquely representative of what this Association purposed to do. I feel bound, therefore, to point out the error signified by such an opinion. This Association exists for ALL the purposes involved in advancing the common interests of university education in this country. It is a sort of federal clearing-house for university problems. These problems are multifold; and we shall take up as many as can be labored upon at any one time. The Committee on Academic Freedom bears no larger importance in the mass of our work than does the so-called grievance committee in a bar association or a medical association. We have already eighteen working committees, each representing a subject of work with its problems. We wish it to be known at large that the Association is devoting itself to no one exclusive task, but to any and all that are germane and pressing.

Among these Committees, I come next to

Committee B: METHODS OF APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION.—I do not propose to offer here any solutions for these problems. Much is first to be done by our Committee in collecting the facts; for the last few years have seen much progress, and variant methods appear to have worked well, in different institutions.

I venture merely to point out that the problem involves the operation of several distinct permanent forces, each with its own dangers of excess, and that the necessity of balancing all of these forces by a single method will often create the dilemma of Scylla and Charybdis.

First there is the balance of force between the Board (of trustees or regents) and the President (representing the faculties). It will not do to let the board have an initial or major personal share in selections or promotions; for they are not experts in the several fields, and they have not the proper data for judgment. The correct balancing here tends to give the real power to the President.

Next, there is the balance of force between the President and the faculty or department concerned. Here there is

again a relative lack of adequate information in the President, as well as a danger to the independence of scholarship by making a dictator of the President. On the other hand, there is the danger of incompetent selection by a group; for a group is always weak, in point of decision.

Finally, there is the balance of force between the head of a department and the members, especially the younger ones. Here the forces of jealousy, and of self-will on the part of the chief are the main dangers. There may be institutions in which the department-head system works well. But, in itself, it seems to me so full of danger that I wish to see it abolished,—so far at least as it affects selections and promotions. If it works well anywhere, the result is in spite of the faulty system. The hope of science is always in the younger men; and the department-head system is calculated to make university life dismal for the younger scholars,—to suppress originality, to fetter academic freedom, and to check scientific progress. It is a system suitable for a cotton-factory, not for a university. Even in the factory, practical economists are pointing out that the department-foreman's excessive powers are the real source of much of industrial unrest. The executive duties of a university-department can be amply performed by a chairman, or other competent drudge.

On the other hand, it is obvious that for promotions (not appointments), the democratic decision of all department-members is impracticable; for they cannot publicly discuss each other's merits. And so between these two difficulties the solution is not easy to find.

In my own opinion, not so much depends upon the governmental structures as upon the spirit of the institution or the group. Some systems have good or bad tendencies; but a good system may work poorly or a bad system may work well, according as the spirit of mutual concession, loyalty, and good fellowship prevails or not. And this will ultimately go back to the personality at the head of all. Have you ever happened to look into Confucius' political philosophy? If we should ever embrace it, many of our academic courses in

the complexities of political science could be dispensed with. "The Master said: The administration of government lies in getting proper men. Such men are to be got by means of the ruler's own character. Therefore the institutions of the ruler are rooted in his own character and conduct, and are sufficiently attested by the masses of the people. . . . When a prince's personal conduct is correct, his government is effective without the issuing of orders. When those who are in high station perform well all their duties, the people are aroused to virtue. . . . If you lead on the people with correctness, who will dare not to be correct?"

Committee C: RECRUITMENT OF THE PROFESSION BY SCHOLARSHIPS AND FELLOWSHIPS.—Of the specific problems regarded as most pressing today in this subject, I know nothing, outside of the law school field, in which it plays little part. But the impression presents itself that some measures would be desirable towards introducing more of the competitive spirit in these awards,—the spirit that so markedly prevails in French university education.

There is little of this spirit yet in American college work. Nearly the maximum of available student calories are expended on athletic competitions. How indeed could we expect to see much intellectual competition, when our own main effort (owing to the importance of tuition fees for college maintenance) is directed to securing the largest possible increase of mere student-numbers? So long as bodies of teachers compete zealously with each other for students, it is not likely that students will compete so zealously for the awards of teachers. Moreover, the non-competitive spirit of students is further depressed by the absolute quantitative methods of grading. The attainment of 120 units (or whatever the figure may be) suffices, regardless of whether ten or four hundred candidates reach it; success is therefore attainable without any personal competition at all. Thus, if in the college a condition of competition is lacking, naturally among graduates seeking the rank of chartered scholars the spirit of competition is difficult to inculcate.

Nevertheless, it is well worth attempting in that part of the field. The stern verdicts of a competitive struggle are a solid test of staying-powers. The competition comes later, in any case, even though it is less controlled and more haphazard; why not institute it earlier?

By a competitive system, I understand three elements to be implied: (1) a limited number of places; (2) a public entry and a public simultaneous award; (3) a substantially identical set of conditions to be fulfilled in a test prescribed *ad hoc*. All of these elements supply some useful feature of competition. (1) Today, the fellowships, though actually limited in number in presumably all institutions, are not so coördinated that the limitation is an obvious stimulus to competition. (2) Today the entries are not so published that the eyes of the university public are upon the candidates. A multitude knew and discussed beforehand the chances of the world's candidates for the Marathon race at Stockholm. When such publicity is secured for the candidates for—let us say—the Sheldon Fellowships at Harvard University and elsewhere, some of the virtue of competition will begin to operate. Nor is there, effectively, any public simultaneous award. The result of the Derby is the one thing in the world which is sure to be flashed over every cable to the obscurest colonies, from Hudson's Bay to the Mauritius. Nobody expects that the populace will care for university awards; but at least the university world could show some interest. Publicity, spotlight publicity, in the student world, is the main zest-inspirer for athletics. We have too long neglected it in our intellectual distinctions. Suppose that the university awards were announced in some general journal—say the BULLETIN of this Association—would not this furnish ultimately a valuable stimulus to competition? (3) The award should be based on a test devised and fulfilled *ad hoc*; for thus only can the candidates be set in virtual competition. Their prior personal record should merely qualify them for the competition, and not as now be the basis of the award; for the variety in such records is too great to make a strict com-

petition possible. This is the element which would be most difficult to devise in practice; but the difficulties are surmountable.

I realize that one most serious obstacle to any competitive arrangements on a large scale is the independence of our several universities. Naturally, some sort of coöperation and mutual sacrifice for the common good would be necessary for achieving any such measures. But such federated coöperation is precisely what this Association professes to encourage, as a main purpose in its formation. If this Association is fit to exist, it is fit to accomplish anything which depends on coöperation.

I offer these views because I am convinced that the nearly complete lack of personal intellectual competition in our university education signifies an unhealthy minus quantity of virility, and that the most feasible place to begin to cultivate it more carefully is in the award of graduate fellowships.

Committee D: CLASSIFICATION OF UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES.—In any attempt to classify here, we must distinguish the possible purposes of using the classification; for a different purpose may call for a different standard.

I. Certainly several different purposes in classification can be seen in the university world today, namely:

(a) To find a basis for membership of individual professors in this Association;

(b) To find a basis for membership of institutions in some other American Association of professional teachers or scientists;

(c) To find a basis for valuation of degrees by State Boards of Education or Boards of Professional Examiners, prescribing qualifications of individual student-applicants;

(d) To find a basis for federal action by the Bureau of Education, Department of the Interior;

(e) To find a basis for grants of pensions or other assistants by the Carnegie Foundation for Teachers, or by other benefactors.

(f) To find a basis for recommendations of institutional consolidation or other alteration, by the same Foundation.

(g) To find a basis for recognition of degrees by citizens' University Clubs in prescribing qualifications for membership.

(h) To find a basis for mutual valuation of degrees or certificates, by American institutions, in order to give credit to migrating students;

(i) To find a basis for mutual valuation of degrees or certificates between American and foreign universities, in order to give credit to migrating students.

It is conceivable, and even probable, that no two or three of these purposes would or ought to result in the same classification. And my first warning is *against assuming that any one classification should be used without scrutiny for more than one purpose.*

II. My next warning is against exclusiveness. And there are several reasons:

(1) One is perhaps sentimental and temperamental only,—the dread of needless offence to the somehow worthy. It is so easy to be snobbish. And the temptation seems to be greater when one is acting corporately. The fact that many of us are ourselves “*nouveaux arrivés*” also enhances the risk. Sempronius, when he leaves the provincial University of Kurdistan, being called to become a member of the ancient and famous University of Byzantium, is prone to become conscious of a new personal greatness, and to look down from the heights of Byzantium's prestige (now his own), with a sudden sense of disparagement, upon the faithful colleagues still laboring in Kurdistan. When he now officiates in a classifying committee, the University of Kurdistan occupies a very different place in the long perspective from that which it possessed a year ago when he was himself a member of it. And the classifying committees are very likely to come chiefly from the Byzantine universities. Down on the Texas border, the report of the Inspectors of Camp Kitchens was being discussed by the boys in khaki. Troop B's kitchen received second grade in the marking for “cleanliness and order”; its

mark was 97 per cent. But the hospital-corps kitchen came out first on the list, with a grade of 98 per cent. "All the same," doggedly said Private Kelly of Troop B, "our kitchen is the best, and my hat is in the ring for the man that disputes it. The Hospital Corps kitchen is 98 per cent? Of course! Good reason why; the hospital corps were the inspectors! To be sure they graded themselves first!"

(2) Another reason is that the grading of the college or university as a whole is an averaging of many corporate features, while the use of these grades is generally directed to fix the status of an individual; and the logical connection is more or less faulty. A great university turns out many ill-trained students; a modest university sends forth many graduates having the soundest attainments. A Virchow or a Brissaud may occupy a chair at a minor institution; and some skilful hacks or brilliant charlatans may have lodged themselves in the distinguished homes of learning.

(3) Another reason is that the proper valuation would require almost omniscience. And the Committee rarely has existed that can assert having made a truly adequate and complete study of all the data for its conclusions. In so serious an undertaking, the standard of conviction for an unfavorable verdict should be proof beyond a reasonable doubt.

(4) Still another reason is that the conditions are yet hardly ripe in this country for a classification based on numerous fine grades between reputable institutions. What is of prime need is a classification of the goats from the sheep. In professional education, at least, the commercial institutions form the real incubus of the country. They flourish under lax charter-laws which permit mercenary incompetents to grant any degree. They delude the well-meaning but ignorant aspirant, by offering the broad and easy road that leadeth to destruction, while the university school is insisting on the straight and narrow path. They watch the legislatures, and they block there all measures which would restrict their own excesses and remedy the evils of the situation. As the cheap

and attractive rivals of the university schools, they are the real enemies of university education. If there is to be any classification, first let them be classified down and out. The first issue is really a moral one, viz., of mercenary versus disinterested education. Until that issue is settled, the classification of the university non-mercenary schools is likely to give unfair impressions. Of late, when classification has been mentioned, you will often hear the opinion expressed that until the mercenary schools are suppressed, a classification of the university schools tends merely to place an excessive burden on the weaker ones who have sound aspirations, while leaving unchecked the brazen activities of the mercenaries. No doubt, this consideration less affects the colleges of liberal arts; but it does affect the university classification problem as a whole.

The foregoing reasons (and others could be invoked) do not militate against classification in general; but they do warn us of the need of caution. I urge upon this Association (as did the President of the Association of American Colleges, at the 1915 meeting) that the postulate of classification be not *exclusiveness*, but *inclusiveness*.

III. As to foreign universities, and their need of aid in recognizing American degrees, a special situation exists; and I recommend that a Committee be appointed to take charge of this subject. The reasons are these:

The scandal of purchased degrees obtained by foreigners from spurious American universities (cropping up from time to time, in Chicago and elsewhere) has long been known,—chiefly affecting the professional and honorary degrees. Much discredit has ensued,—the discredit being due mainly to our lax State-charter laws. But it would certainly be unfortunate if here the sheep were to be classified equally into the limbo of the goats, and if foreign universities were to refuse entirely to credit even the diplomas of some hundred or more American institutions of first rank.

Such an unfortunate result has nevertheless come about, in Germany at least, in recent years. This result is due to a

misunderstanding of the significance of the roster of membership in the Association of American Universities. The following facts are taken from a Committee report presented at the 13th Annual Meeting of that Association: In January, 1905, the Faculty of the University of Berlin sent word that "the Faculty recognizes every bachelor's degree (A.B., B.S., etc.) acquired at an American University as the equivalent of the German certificate of admission"; but that "towards the prescribed triennium," *i. e.*, within the German University course, only time spent after the bachelor's degree "at one of the universities belonging to the Association of American Universities" shall be reckoned. On this second clause, which was obviously radical and exclusive, I have no comment here to make.

But the terms of the first clause of the Berlin resolution, which were not exclusive (A.B. diploma for matriculation), were not adhered to. "The construction placed upon this enactment," we learn, "has been in actual practice that only the degrees bestowed by the members of the Association have been accepted as *fulfilling the conditions of matriculation*"; and this "ultimately has become the policy generally of the universities of Germany, and incidentally those of Holland." The report gives no details from which can be learned just how and why the German universities were moved to take this action; nor just how or when the American Association first learned of the strange construction of the enactment. But it does give the assurance that, on the part of the latter, "this result . . . had never been intended or foreseen." In 1908 a committee chaired by President Eliot pointed out that "our colleges are suffering from this interpretation," as well as other universities not members of the Association, and declared it to be the duty of the Association either "to admit outstanding American universities" after classifying them, or "to notify those governments that there are American universities outside this Association whose work and standing are not inferior to universities now members of the Association."

Nevertheless, though committees were appointed, nothing appears to have been actually done by that Association, to correct the injustice, *for five years*. In November, 1913, its committee reported (and the report was approved) that it had prepared (with the aid of the Carnegie Foundation) a list of 119 institutions "*whose standards of accomplishment are unquestionably recognized by the Association as fulfilling the conditions of [German] matriculation and are rightly entitled to share with the members of the Association in such privilege*"; and it proposed that the German Ministries of Education be recommended to recognize the bachelor's degrees from all those institutions. The later reports of the Association do not show whether this tardy recommendation produced actual results; but within a year the war had broken out.

The blackballing of all but twenty-four American universities and colleges in the halls of foreign learning is a condition of things which must appeal to an impartial observer as a gross injustice. Not alone is the repute of meritorious institutions clouded, to an extent which is beyond reparation for some time to come. But the indirect effects upon the standing of individual scientists and graduates are humiliating and damaging. In the journals of science, the signatures of the professors from these *non est* institutions are supercilious. In the intellectual commerce at international congresses and on visits of observation at foreign institutions, the names of these universities are no accredited introduction. And the aspiring graduate who seeks foreign masters is virtually barred from any candidacy for degrees. The harm was unintended and unforeseen; but this gives no satisfaction to those who have suffered from it.

No doubt the name chosen by that Association (whose eminent services within its chosen field may cheerfully be conceded) was one which in itself carried possibilities (now verified) of misunderstanding, both abroad and in our own lay public. "Association of Graduate Schools," or "Association for the Cultivation (or Restriction) of Higher Degrees,"

would have epitomized more correctly the limited purposes avowed in its own constitution. "We the People of England," began the Three Tailors of Tooley Street in their celebrated memorial; but even had they been the twenty-four most fashionable tailors of Oxford Street, the cynosures of sartorial superfection, the hyperbole, however harmless at home, might have given rise to misconception abroad.

Furthermore, the Berlin decree—apart from this first clause (A.B. for matriculation) and the narrowed construction given to it in practice by the German universities—expressly gave a monopoly of recognition, to members of the Association of American Universities, for *time spent towards the higher degrees*. This monopoly was accepted by that Association with entire ease of mind. But is there here also no unfair hardship upon graduates of non-member institutions? Is it a fact that a qualified graduate in no other institution, in no department of learning, can do anything worth recognizing as time spent? Is it possible that Amherst, Brown, Bryn Mawr, Dartmouth, Knox, Massachusetts Technology, Oberlin, Purdue, Williams—and I need not name other examples—is it possible that their graduate work, scanty as may be the number of students, is lacking in quality, so that it must be indiscriminately rejected? Is it necessary to deny recognition to graduate work done under individual scholars who have made American scholarship proud in the world,—masters in Semitic philology like Stevenson of Vanderbilt, or in English literature like Gummere of Haverford? Purdue University does not figure in the list which Berlin recognizes; and yet a Berlin friend, a professor of engineering, made a pilgrimage to this country a few years ago to study the superior locomotive-testing devices in use at Purdue!

And if we turn to the professional schools of the *non est* universities—law, medicine, dentistry, etc.—is it possible to suppose that (for example) no medical studies at any university but the twenty on the Association list should receive any recognition? In fact, the Council of Medical Education

(of the American Medical Association) in its 1911 classification of Medical Schools, enumerating twenty-four schools of highest grade (class A+), relegated *three of these Association schools to its second grade*, while placing eight of the *non est* university schools in its highest grade. Dr. Flexner's report to the Carnegie Foundation ("Medical Education in the United States") shows likewise, in its chiaroscuro, some plain incongruencies with the Association's distinctions. What can be said of the fairness or trustworthiness of a universities-list which would result in German universities giving credit for medical studies in three schools graded second by our own American Medical Council, while rejecting studies pursued at eight schools graded first by the Council?

Fortunately, the harmful consequences appear thus far to have been confined to our interests in Germany and Holland (though there are indicia of effects elsewhere). But the situation is one which cannot be allowed to expand; and upon our Association has obviously and emphatically fallen the duty to forestall further misunderstanding, and to take the active measures necessary to protect American institutions at large.

I have, therefore, during the year opened negotiations with universities all over the world, looking to an exchange of information with reference to the mutual recognition of degrees. And I recommend that at this Annual Meeting a Committee be appointed on the Recognition of American Degrees by Foreign Universities. This committee is needed, quite apart from the incident just set forth; because the bewildering variety of American institutions, and the general lack of that State regulation to which foreign universities are accustomed, make it an impossible task for the foreign authorities to discriminate soundly without competent and impartial American advice.

Committee G: CAUSES AND REMEDIES FOR THE ALLEGED DECLINE IN THE INTELLECTUAL INTERESTS OF COLLEGE STUDENTS.—More than one member of the Association has written to me to express the opinion that this is the topic of

prime importance for American colleges today. And it is so, unquestionably, in the sense that it goes to the core of our professional duty, and questions the success of our performance of that duty. For if in fact the intellectual interests of the college student have declined, it will be the most serious professional fault if we do not make it our first task to find the causes and apply the remedies.

The *fact* of the decline, being a matter of comparison between our own subjective experiences of thirty years ago and our objective experience with the student body of today, is not easy to establish in specific detail. But as a broad fact I credit its existence.

The *causes* of the facts will no doubt be variously attributed. Ignoring the outer circle of causes (consisting in certain changes of social habits), and looking at the immediate causes only, I believe that a most influential one will be found to consist of a change (by increase) in the relative proportions of non-intellectual interests in the student body. Today three classes of students seem to me to bulk larger than was the case in my own day. There are the rich-parented, with too much money to spend. They come to college because it is fashionable; and I know of an eminent educator in a distinguished university who has defended their presence on the ground (not compatible with true university ideals) that even though they fail to study effectively, they are at least better off than if they had not come at all. Then there are the poor-parented, with not enough money. Their time is largely absorbed by necessary labor for a living. Under this burden, a large number of these (not the brilliant ones) are incapable of keeping the proper pace in college standards; hence, their large proportion in the student body keeps down the general pace appreciably. Moreover, their money-earning tasks use up that portion of their time, outside of the required studies, which would otherwise be available for general intellectual browsing; and every one of us can testify that these ramblings into sundry pasturage, outside the ten-acre curriculum lot, were among the best influences for his future.

Then there are the athletic devotees, both actors and spectators; and this group seems to have increased vastly. Notably, the ideal of athletic distinction bulks larger among student ideals.

Some attention should be given by our committee to the different conditions prevailing in the colleges and in the professional schools. My impression is that teachers of law and of medicine would bear testimony, almost unanimously (excepting perhaps in a few institutions where a personal union in dormitory and campus assimilates the college and the professional bodies) that there is nothing to complain of, in the way of an intellectual decline; that rather a decided improvement, if anything, has been noticeable,—a progress from perfunctory task-work to broad-minded zest and absorbing devotion. If this be so, the college situation is presumably remediable, being due to college causes, and not to fixed outside causes.

But in applying whatever remedies may be deemed apt, one thing seems plain, viz., the remedies must include a free elimination of those students who do not measure up to high standards of strictly college work. Now this free hand to eliminate is practically impossible, so long as we are restrained by the counter-motive of keeping up high numbers of attendance. We cannot readily drop the indifferent class of students so long as the effect would be to reduce the total numbers, and thereby to reduce the assets of the institution and the prestige of its size. Let us frankly confess this. Back of any substantial reform in the direction of restoring the domination of intellectual interests must ultimately be a repudiation by university authorities of the ambition for size, and a decrease of the proportion which fees bear to endowed income in total expenses.

The latter change will be a long time in coming, and is hardly within the personal influence of any of us. But the former is within our own power. It is a question of personal ideals. I suppose that there is not an annual report of any secretary or dean or president in this country which does not

begin as follows: "During the past year, the figures show a gain in students as follows: . . . Of this *gain*, — per cent was from within the State, and — per cent from without it, etc. etc." Gain! I wish that the word could be tabooed in every university report. *Increase* would correctly state the mere fact; but why call it *gain*? We all know that it is in some respects an educational *loss*; for larger numbers mean larger classes and fewer relative facilities. Educationally, this new larger class will for the most part be worse off than the old smaller class.

This ingenuous worship of mere numbers is found in every institution in the land, and not less in those which are old and solid and rich enough to be able to dispense with it. Of course, it has its history and its condonations. But "*tout comprendre, c'est tout pardonner*" does not apply here. You can pardon a fact, but you cannot pardon a faulty ideal. And the time has come for us to repudiate candidly the ideal. Quality, not quantity, should be our aim. And the recent proposal, in more than one institution, to set a fixed limit of numbers, is a first move in the right direction.

Committee H: DESIRABILITY AND PRACTICABILITY OF INCREASED MIGRATION AND INTERCHANGE OF GRADUATE STUDENTS.—Of the actual extent and conditions of student migration today, I confess that I know nothing, outside of the field of law. But I should like to register here the desire to see a greater part played, in American university life, by a certain attitude which ought to be one of the strongest motives behind migration—I mean, the *respect for the individual master*, as contrasted with the prestige of the impersonal institution. We inherit from England the seeds of our strong college loyalty; the rivalries of athletics have intensified it; and our alumni propaganda are a perpetual nourishment of it. The Continental observer always wonders at it; and we ourselves remark the relative lack of it on the Continent.

The intensity of it helps to check the growth of the contrasted sentiment,—the respect for a famous master, the custom of journeying to sit at his feet, and the desire to test by

personal experience the fame of various masters. This sentiment is a worthy one,—the natural product of an environment of intense scientific and scholarly zeal. Our American university life does not have enough of it. We may well wish to have more of it, even at the cost of some diminution of the other sentiment of institutional loyalty. The graduate schools no doubt are helping its growth rapidly. But it ought to penetrate somewhat downwards also, into the senior colleges. And for this reason I hope to see our committee, in their report upon the details of present problems, accept as a postulate the desirability of cultivating among mature students the principle of freely seeking the notable masters wherever they may be.

Committee I: UNIVERSITY ETHICS.—That there are numerous problems of ethics peculiar to university life, the least reflection will show. But that they are susceptible of decision by any general canons of behavior might not be so apparent. Yet all other professions acknowledge the propriety and existence of a body of ethical rules; and why not the profession of teaching? Moreover, the communal life in a single encampment—an element shared with the military profession, but lacking in the medical and legal profession—adds to the need and possibility.

Now for the first time, since the formation of this Association, has the profession an organ of expression and a means of sanction for its professional ethical consensus. This is reason enough why we should proceed without delay to exercise that function.

I know not what the theoretics of the subject may point out; the chairman of the committee is there preëminently the one to defer to. But I am convinced, from observation of the other professions, that the effective and feasible method of building up a system of practical ethics, in this stage of our professional organization, is by casuistry. Casuistry, of course, in its best and original sense, is the building up of a system of principles of conduct by the authoritative decision of *specific cases* presented from time to time. Though the

name acquired a reprobate meaning in the degeneration of its use by ecclesiastics, nevertheless the identical system has also served, in the right hands and under right conditions, to build up some of the most useful and enduring systems of law. Roman law for four centuries under the Jurisprudents, Jewish law for several centuries in the Ghemara of the Rabbis, English law for six centuries under the Judges, and Japanese law for at least two centuries under the Tokugawa officials, were all developed by case-law. The law-declarers used the specific dispute between individuals as the vehicle for the incidental declaration of principle,—so much of a principle as sufficed to settle that case with apparent justice. And the accumulation of successive case-records led to greater elaboration of principles and to more accurate systematization. Occasional statute and custom can be obeyed and yet be woven into a body of case-law. And in the absence of an all-pervading legislative body, case-law may be the best possible mode of doing justice to individuals while observing general principles.

In our own situation, therefore, I look to case-judgments as the most promising method for building up a system of professional ethics. And I note with satisfaction that the committee, in its original message to the Association, announced its intention to employ this method. It now remains for the members to show their appreciation of the opportunity.

Committee J: DISTINCTIONS BETWEEN THE SEVERAL HONORARY DEGREES AND THE BASIS FOR CONFERRING THEM.—There has never been a time when book-knowledge was not either revered or feared by the mass of the community. The status of the *Doctores* in public opinion—that part of it which exercises the intelligent power—has been a barometer of the national intelligence. In our own nation, if the universities have not been feared, so too they have been less revered. The last generation has seen a remarkable advance in the degree of respect accorded to them and their *ipse dixit*.

Now the practice of conferring honorary degrees is one of

the important expressions of this popular status of the universities. Whatever its incongruities, the practice is one of solid meaning. To abolish it would be to divorce *pro tanto* the universities from public sentiment. We have no Confucian system of State morals, in which State rewards of virtue are given to encourage morality. The honorary degrees are for us the only accepted certificates of public individual merit. To abandon the custom would be a great error. In the deliberations of university senates you will sometimes hear proposed the total abandonment of honorary degrees. This proposal should not be encouraged.

Nor need we attempt to control or limit the unworthy bestowal of such degrees in the individual case. Even for the earned degrees of the curriculum, the definition of individual merits is difficult enough; much more intractable is the gauging of personal worth where the vague standards of adult achievement are concerned. And inevitably such standards will be relative. To the University of Byzantium, only a Mahomet may loom large enough; to the College of Khartoum or Biserta, the Sheikh Abdullah may be a holy man of worth. When the eminent lawyer, George F. Peck (once well known as general counsel of the Santa Fé Road, and familiar on the platform as a Republican "spellbinder" throughout the Southwest), came back (this was long ago) from a London conference with the English stockholders, and made his first reappearance on the platform at home in Topeka, he wore a suit of clothes that had been hastily fitted by a London tailor to his ample form. He felt constrained to apologize to his audience, after the informal Western manner, for the brevity and constricted measurements of his garments; "they seemed large enough" he added, "when I got them in London." "Niver mind, Mr. Peck," shouted a friendly Irishman standing in the front of the throng: "Ye know, ye're a bigger man in Topayka than ye are in London!" In our American variety of institutions, scattered over the country and voicing local ideals, the local institution will always be uncontrollably free to determine who is the bigger

man in its own local estimation. To attempt to check the occasional absurdities in selection of personal worth by any general regulation is not possible.

But there is one thing that can be done and ought to be done, viz., the standard *classification and distinction of the degrees* themselves. That is the real source today of the confusion. When Khartoum College and University of Byzantium alike bestow a degree on some esoteric Tycho Brahe, the community at large is not disturbed by Khartoum College's possible exaggeration of merit; it simply pays no attention, because it does not know where or what Khartoum is. But it does know Byzantium's fame, and it is ready to give honor to Byzantium's nominee, if only it knew what kind of honor to give. There is, for example, a sense of incongruity upon learning that the achievements for which a Doctorate of Laws was bestowed on Tycho Brahe were in the world's work of astronomy. And (with apologies for illustrating with the name of an honored friend) does the Doctorate of Laws fittingly imply George Washington Goethals' tremendous engineering achievement? (His Sunday Court was indeed a wonderful invention, which in its significance for American law today was alone deserving of a Legum Doctor; but that does not seem to have been the basis of bestowal.)

My hope is, therefore, that our committee will determine at least to define the several honorary degrees one from the other, so as to standardize their implications, so far as feasible.

Now, in this task, radical measures will be needed. The present confusion is hopeless to remove by mere readjustment of present terms. There will have to be both destruction and creation. The destruction will consist in absolutely severing from the honorary list any terms also used for the earned list; the two must speak in unmistakably separate import. The creation will consist in inventing a few new terms to convey necessary discriminations.

Let us hope, then, that our committee will not fear to be radical. This association will have virtually the power to carry out any scheme which it approves. Should a truly

rational scheme be devised and approved, our members have the influence to put it into force immediately throughout the country.

Committee K: UTILIZING THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT BUREAUS FOR GRADUATE UNIVERSITY WORK, AND IN PARTICULAR THE PROPOSED FEDERAL UNIVERSITY AT WASHINGTON.—At this time, the pressing question is whether this Association approves any plan for a Federal University at Washington. A bill to establish one was pending in the last Congress. I am obliged to believe that we should disapprove any such plan. The main reasons for this belief are two; one affects the Washington situation in general; the other concerns the present administrative status of federal education.

The Washington situation postulates control by Congressional committees. There could hardly be a more incompetent method of control,—whether for administration in general, or for a federal university in particular. The several departments, not only in their large central measures, but in their several bureau affairs, are each virtually under the thumb of the particular committee of House and Senate. Some of our members may not sufficiently realize this fact; I ask them to inquire of others who know. The Congressional committees include many conscientious men; but they will never include men who are competent to have the say in university affairs which they do have today in affairs of forestry and a hundred other technical branches. The analogy of boards of trustees or regents cannot be invoked; Congressional committees do and will govern very differently from such boards. To enlarge on this for those who know the situation is needless. Suffice it to offer the conviction that the prospect of a federal university, commanding unqualified respect and admiration under Congressional committee control, is unthinkable.

The second reason is that even if, by some miracle, Congressional committee control were eliminated, the federal status of education is as yet too alien to our traditions to permit of a just position for a federal university. The least measure that would give to a federal university the necessary

scientific and administrative independence must imply a body separate from any executive department and more self-controlled than either the Congressional Library or the Smithsonian Institution. Its board must have (a) a financial authority independent in details of a Congressional committee; (b) an appointing power independent of the President; (c) an administrative power to utilize the departmental equipments; (d) its own selection subjected to nomination (or some other direct professional influence) by the American universities at large.

And yet, how would such a board fit in with any of the traditions yet obtaining for federal education? Today, the Bureau of Education is one of many under the Department of the Interior, which is under the President; and Congress holds the reins over all. To insert anywhere in this scheme a federal university is inconsistent with even moderate ideals for the place which such an institution should occupy in American science and learning. The least existing analogy that would approach the ideal would be a separate ministry of education, like that of France; but without any basic body of primary, secondary, and collegiate education such a ministry would be out of place. The approach to the problem should not be through any existing administrative analogies, but rather from that of the National Academy of Sciences. If the National Academy of Sciences were enlarged to include full representation of the social sciences and of letters, and if from its members a board were selected, and the full powers above enumerated were bestowed, we might have ground to hope for a real university. But can we expect to obtain any such break with federal traditions?

These are some of the reasons for being skeptical towards the proposed federal university.

Committee L: EXCHANGE PROFESSORSHIPS AND FELLOWSHIPS WITH LATIN-AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES;

Committee M: RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SECOND PAN-AMERICAN SCIENTIFIC CONGRESS INVOLVING UNIVERSITY ACTIVITIES.

These two Committees have a task of the most pressing and beneficent import. It has been pending since the First Pan-American Scientific Congress, several years ago. Let us hope that this Association may be destined to accomplish something substantial.

The main factor seems to be the need for effecting a conscious and active intellectual fraternization with our fellow-republicans of Latin-America. When the present terrific military conflict is over, this nation will have no friends. Let us not conceal from ourselves that probability. Not responding to the best instincts of unbiased public opinion, but restraining ourselves by a too cautious prudence, we did not generously and frankly align ourselves, in that great moral issue, with the cause of the defenders, in resistance to a misguided and detestable philosophy of unscrupulous political aggressiveness. We did not even boldly assume leadership of a union of neutrals, against the initial violations of neutral rights effected by land forces and by marine mines. And, even as a charitable spectator, having racial sympathies in every region of Europe, we did not do our natural share in contributing our wealth to the victims in the countries overridden by military destruction. The result is that we do not possess either affection as a friend, admiration as a champion, or gratitude as a benefactor, in quarters where such feelings might have been dominant. Whatever individuals may have done or deserved, our nation in its world-relations stands on the whole in this unattractive status. The only occidental peoples that remain, for the next generation, open to genuine friendships with us are the Latin-Americans. And even there we have an inheritance of distrust.

If we possess any sense of the absolute need of international friendships, we must consciously seek them. Thus only can friendship arise.

Ties of commerce are being woven, and this will do a great deal. But commerce is more or less self-seeking, and friendship demands something more. Intellectual community and

exchange must be that something more. No other or surer starting point can be found than the universities. It will be a slow process; therefore all the more needful to begin it at once.

The details will of course be elaborated by our committees. But I point out that this is emphatically a situation where money is needed. Every great reform, said Talleyrand (was it he?), becomes ultimately a question of money. Certainly this one does. The question of men is here a difficult one, indeed; for the eminent astronomers and zoölogists of the two continents will seldom be fluent in each other's language. But this difficulty can be overcome. What is needed is an endowment (or a twenty-year fund) to enable these exchanges and other measures to be put immediately into effect. Government appropriations will not do; for Congressional Committees would not be competent in this field. No better use could be found for benevolent wealth than to endow the plans of this committee. Let us hope that the committee will find a sympathetic benefactor.

Committee N: HANDBOOK OF AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES.—My starting-point here is that the present lack of such a handbook is, not only a serious inconvenience to all of us, but a real reproach to our self-respect; and that therefore some way must be devised to institute one.

One of the first oddnesses of American life that strikes the traveler from England, France, Germany, or Italy is our dependence on individual railway "folders"; there is a general "Pathfinder," but it is not suitable, and nobody uses it. A main reason is the competitive traditions of the several railways. So also with our universities and colleges. There are abundant competitive catalogues, but no general compendium. There could be and there ought to be a unitary reference book, in which could be found all the facts about all the institutions. Catalogs contain the elaborate details which students need, together with more or less self-laudation. But the large body of university officers, editors, publishers, and others, need a compendium of the mere facts, unmixed with either critical judgment or self-interested gloss. The

volume "Minerva" would represent, with some essential alterations, what we need.

Our committee is finding obstacles, caused by private publishers' hesitations. But if we are genuinely convinced that American institutions ought to have such a book, then surely these obstacles can be overcome. The Federal Bureau of Education has expressed its full desire to assist. I urge this Association to give assurance of its belief in the need of fulfilling this task.

Committee O: STANDARDIZATION OF REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF PH.D.—The task of this committee is a difficult one. The opinion has been expressed by some that it is an insuperable one. I do not believe this. An ideal but flexible scheme can certainly be devised, although the practical use and extension of it might be slow in coming. Certainly, the great need for some improvement ought to be a strong motive.

I wish here only to suggest two enlargements for the committee's task,—that is, enlargements of jurisdiction beyond its literal titular scope, viz., to include the standardization of *professional degrees*, and to include the valorization of the *foreign degrees*.

(a) Among the professional degrees the law list exhibits a serious confusion. The Master of Laws, the Master of Arts (for Law), the Juris Baccalaureus, the Juris Doctor, the Doctor of Common (or of Civil) Law,—all these degrees today are given; and there is a real need both of valorization and of standardization. Only local traditions, and some vagaries of popular student-craving, obstruct the way of a standard nomenclature and standard requirements. In this and other fields there is something to be done which our committee can do. No doubt, some sacrifice of cherished notions would be needed for many institutions. But if our committee and this Association can agree upon a generally acceptable scheme, the individual institutions can be trusted to conform sooner or later. I recommend that the committee be expressly requested to include this subject within its scope.

(b) History has so twisted the threads of development that the names of American University degrees no longer correspond with those of European and Latin-American countries. The German and the American Doctorates of Philosophy are perhaps the only two that in very name reveal their correspondence; and that is because the latter was patterned after the former. The degree system of the English, Scotch, French, Dutch, Italian, and Spanish Universities bears each a nomenclature which does not tally with our own. Not merely is it, therefore, sometimes misleading, but it is seldom or never self-explanatory. What is needed is a valorization of terms. It is needed not merely for theory's sake, but for the practical advantage of our own graduate scholars who have studied abroad. The great majority of our university presidents, to whom come the testimonials, are presumably unacquainted with the significance of the variant foreign systems.

If our committee were to prepare and place on record a brief key to the standard implications of the foreign terms, a valuable service would be rendered. I recommend that the committee treat this subject as falling within the scope of their task.

Committee P: PENSIONS AND LIFE INSURANCE FOR PROFESSORS.—This subject, especially the specific proposals made in President Pritchett's recent publication of the Carnegie Foundation, involves technical profundities with which our committee is well qualified to cope. But it also involves certain general policies upon which all of us are entitled to an opinion; and I offer the following views:

I do not favor the proposal made in that publication; and the reasons are as follows:

(1) I do not disfavor it (as some do) because of any personal distrust or lack of sympathy with the methods of the Foundation. The founder's idea was a noble and unique one; himself and his trustees are entitled to our heartiest gratitude and cordial sympathy. The grumbling and even hostile attitude sometimes exhibited is not justifiable. All parties

can and should approach the subject in a spirit of desire for frank exchange of views and of mutual support. The funds are in the hands of wise and devoted experts, and every intendment (as the lawyers say) must be made in their favor.

(2) I do not disfavor it (as some do) because of a distrust caused by the unexpected issue of the original actuarial reckonings. The situation at the outset was novel; the enterprise was in some degree inevitably experimental and alterable. The trustees were and are morally entitled to make such changes as may seem absolutely necessary; the propriety of fulfilling natural expectations of beneficiaries being as obvious to the trustees as to others. Whatever change of plan is proposed will properly rest for its adoption upon the just and enlightened judgment of the trustees after full deliberation.

(3) I do not disfavor it (as some do) because of a doubt as to the wisdom of attempts by an independent endowed board to control or influence the standards and management of individual educational institutions. On the contrary, I believe that such influence offers in America the best, if not the only hope for hastening general and radical improvements of college and university standards. We inherit an individualistic system, not one of rigid State interference; and this inheritance is a good thing for the world. We should preserve it. We do not want to be Prussianized, and we should not wish to be. But individualism tends to unchecked license,—to rank profusion of weeds choking valuable plants. And if we are to refuse State regulation, how shall we apply the needful check? The traditional method, in our inherited system, is again the power of private individual effort, applying remedies by setting counter-forces to work. In short, a proper function of the Carnegie Foundation, or some like device, is to eliminate the educational weeds and to improve the weaker plants by suitable methods. Thus we shall preserve our individualism while avoiding its shortcomings.

It is, therefore, perfectly appropriate that the Foundation, by a system of rewards to colleges and universities, should use its influence to improve general conditions.

But the reasons which avail with me are these:

(a) Assuming the propriety of the Foundation's aim to influence institutional improvement by a system of rewards, it is nevertheless *not* appropriate to unite this aim with a system of personal pensions to professors. For there is no just connection between the two. Take, for example, the professor of Greek at Damascus College. The Foundation, after scrutiny, decides that the trustees' methods of investment are faulty and their system of accounting is defective; therefore it declines to place Damascus on the accepted list, unless these conditions are changed; therefore the professor of Greek at Damascus is not eligible for a pension. But what has *he* to do with the trustees' methods? He cannot control nor influence nor meddle with the trustees; he accepted his appointment and pursues his studies and his teaching without any share of merit or demerit in those other matters. And the propriety and need of pensions for meritorious professors of Greek as a class is an invariable fact, whatever may be the variations of local trustees' methods where individual Greek professors are found. Scientifically therefore, the two are not connected. True, it is argued that the professors of Greek, by a process of natural selection, will discriminate against institutions not on the accepted list. But this influence can only be small and slow in operation; moreover, the burden of the penalty thus falls upon individual professors in the meantime, in the hope of producing indirectly a desired effect over which he has no direct control, instead of falling directly on the trustees; which does not seem equitable.

Take, again, the exclusion of institutions having specific sectarian limitations. The professors in such institutions as the University of Chicago and Northwestern University have the most varied theological affiliations; they cannot influence directly any change in the charters; and to make the effort would expose them to the charge of purely selfish motives; their own needs of pension, as a class, are precisely the same as in any other institution. For the Foundation to say directly to a board of trustees: "We will make your institution

a general grant of aid if you will secure an abandonment of your sectarian provisoes," is at least an appropriate attitude to take. But to say to the *professors*: "We exclude you from eligibility to a pension devoted to the welfare of professors as a class, because your scholarly work is being done under a board which retains undesirable sectarian provisoes, even though they do not affect your own work and are not within your control," seems to me both illogical and ineffective.

In short, a fundamental error of the Foundation has been its mingling of two separate purposes, each admirable in itself, but not suitable to be yoked together, viz., the pensioning of individual scholars, and the improvement of institutional standards of management. The former purpose rests on the theory that the able scholar voluntarily sacrifices the contingent prizes of a commercial career in order to pursue the pure research necessary for human progress; and that the assurance of a competency at the age of retirement would thus contribute to advance the cause of science, by protecting it from the rivalry of ordinary commercial pursuits. Now this sound theory aims to affect the motives of the individual scholar; and, therefore, its mechanism should deal with the individual scholar and with him alone.

Such is a reason why I cannot favor any proposal which involves even closer relations of control between Foundation and university boards as a part of a plan to pension or insure the individual scholar.

(b) Moreover, even in pursuing its chosen path, the Foundation seems to me to have missed the one most effective way to attain its aim of influencing educational improvement through personal pensions, viz., by bearing the economic burden of the removal of unfit institutions. In all economic improvements there is a transition period of waste, in which the old is scrapped while the new is being installed. In this period, the adjustment of the human workers to the new conditions has always given rise to ill-feeling and suffering; the English experiences during the spread of the factory-machine system in the early 1800s are of course an obvious example.

And in such a period, every true man's sympathy goes out, as Charles Kingsley's did, to the workers who are displaced by the change, even though he recognizes that the change is inevitable.

Such is the condition today in the American educational system. There is an abundance of ill-directed energy; there ought to be many consolidations and eliminations of institutions. The Vermont report of the Foundation illustrates it. But what to do with the worthy scholars who have officiated in them? This is a problem which no man of feeling can face with any satisfaction. Are the professors of the eliminable institutions to be scrapped like the buildings?

Here was a plain opportunity for the Foundation to effect directly its aim of educational improvement by the method of pensions. Suppose it were to say to the individual scholars: "If you will resign, we will take care of you all; the older ones will be retired on life pensions; the others will be carried on term pensions until they can find other places"; the aim would have been realized very promptly. With the professors taken care of, the board of trustees would have had to yield to proposals. By a general use of this method the Foundation could have achieved more radical effects in the briefest time. And the effects would have been at the most needed points of the scale, *i. e.*, at the bottom, where the most waste of energy was going on and the least chance of self-initiated improvement. No doubt the method would seem radical; it would amount to saying to the board: "We will denude you of a Faculty; so that you may as well accept our proposals." But it would commend itself as the only feasible and just method of getting at these weakest spots in our educational system. And if there was to be any mingling at all of the two functions, this would have been the permissible one, in that it used the pension method merely as a temporary means to the other general end. As it is, the Foundation, with a divided aim, does not radically succeed in either.

(c) A further reason for disfavoring the new proposals is

that they ignore the obvious better method, viz., that of asking for more money. The proposals point out the insufficiency of the present endowment, and their suggested remedy is to limit the present scope of the Foundation's income. In other words, if (say) \$25,000,000 were now available, the problem would not have arisen, and the proposals would not have been made. But is it not consistent with the sincerest gratitude to the founder to ask whether the trustees have discovered it to be hopeless to expect a doubling of the endowment, if the request were made? One who has shown such profound and intelligent interest in this unique and well-judged method of advancing the cause of science can certainly not be expected to have lost interest in the good cause. It can only be a question of the means available to continue and complete its advancement. Before so radical a change as proposed is made, going down to the roots of our educational system and entering into our personal habits and instincts, may we not ask the trustees whether they have exhausted the possibilities of benefaction to the Foundation? I consider that such a question is perfectly compatible with the most appreciative gratitude of the profession for the existing benefaction and the heartiest admiration for the insight and wisdom of the founder. And those sentiments would remain in the same degree, no matter what the answer to the question.

I have now reviewed the general subjects of the Association's work, and I turn to the three committee-subjects affecting its internal organization:

Committee E: QUALIFICATIONS OF MEMBERSHIP.—On this subject, a year's observation has convinced me that the Association must not set itself up to be a select club. If it were to do so, it must abandon the title "American," to which it would then have no right. It ought to be a body fully representative of the profession. And like other professional associations, its limitations on eligibility must be only such as insure the personal good standing of the individual and exclude the immature and the ephemeral. I wil

not attempt to argue this. Perhaps it is partly a matter of temperament for all of us, and therefore argument may be wasted. I will merely point out that the analogies of all other professional associations point in the same way, and that this at least raises a presumption.

As practical measures embodying this view, I favor the following:

(a) The Association should vote to omit from the Constitution the qualifying phrase "scientific productivity," and should sanction a rule for the Committee on Membership making an appointment to a faculty in some approved list of institutions *prima facie* evidence of the possession of the prescribed qualifications.

(b) The Association should vote to amend the Constitution by placing elections to membership in the hands of the Committee on Membership, thus withdrawing the necessity for a vote of election by the Association at the Annual Meeting. This is the mode employed in the virtually all large clubs and professional associations; and it is the only workable method for large bodies.

(c) A junior membership should be established, which will permit the inclusion of younger scholars who have definitely devoted themselves to a university career. This junior membership need not include all of the privileges of full membership. But it is necessary, so as to affiliate the sentiments and consolidate the energies of the rising generation; and they will later be all the more ready to seek full membership as something natural and desirable.

Committee F: LOCAL CHAPTERS OR GROUPS.—This Association, meeting annually only, needs especially to keep up consciously its associate life throughout the year. Moreover, on the important subjects awaiting annual decision, it needs to ensure a sifting process throughout the year, so that the final expression of opinion is a mature one. Both these necessary aims are attained by the single expedient of local chapters or groups. That they are indispensable, in some form, seems to me unquestionable.

But it does not follow that the form should be identical everywhere. Flexibility is needed. Much difference of opinion has developed as to the mode of organizing and using the chapters. These differences are precisely a reason for local variation; but I know of no differences of opinion which would not be met by providing such flexibility. Let us therefore all agree to proceed with the experiment, with a view to profiting by experience and later making changes that may seem desirable.

Committee Q: COÖPERATIVE SCHEDULE FOR PLACE OF ANNUAL MEETING.—The problem, where and when to meet, with least probability of conflicting claims of allegiance to other professional associations, has been given, by vote of the Council, to a special committee to solve before the next Annual Meeting.

Hitherto, no one association has enlisted the interest of professors in all branches; though several professional associations have each claimed a more or less separate group of persons. Hence, the meetings gave rise to few conflicting claims. The branches of natural science have solved their problem by a schedule peculiar to themselves. The branches of history, political science, economics, philosophy, psychology, philology (classical and modern), law, and a few others, have each devised orbits which answered the purpose passably. But our own Association cuts across all of these. And unless some general scheme be devised for concordance between all, our Association is destined always to present to some large group of its membership a conflict of claims for attendance at the Annual Meeting.

The perpetual continuance of this dilemma seems needless. Accordingly a Committee has been appointed to examine the facts and devise a plan which will permit the annual meetings of all of the special associations to be held at the same time and place, on the first four days of a week, to be followed by the annual meeting of this Association on the last two days of the same week. By such a plan all associations would gain and none would lose. No doubt some sacrifices of

tradition would have to be made here and there. But with mutual good-will and a strong sense of the need for concordance, the problem can and will be solved.

It remains to invite your attention to the need of another Committee, to be appointed for reporting upon the subject of

SUMMER SCHOOL ORGANIZATION. This subject is an important one, in that the summer school threatens to bleed away the life-currents of American scholarship; and it presses for prompt attention, in that the harm has already proceeded apace.

What is the function of a university? Its function is double; first, to maintain in respectable comfort a body of scholars engaged solely in the search for truth; secondly, to give higher instruction to a group of youths. Each of these functions is as essential as the other, both historically and ideally. But at different times and places the one or the other has obtained more emphasis. Let us call one the sapiential function (remembering that the University of Rome is still known as the "Sapienza"); the other, the pedagogic.

Now in the European universities the sapiential function has been and still is the emphasized one,—over-emphasized, indeed. All Americans who have studied on the Continent have observed this, in the relative importance which the professors—the full professors, at least—give to their own chosen tasks of research over the tasks of mere instruction. The terms are shorter than ours; and instances abound of the independence of the professors in shortening the courses and reducing the hours of lectures, so as to resume more avidly their work on some *magnum opus*. How far this is carried, I once had a good opportunity to observe, during a spring visit to Italy, some ten years ago, when the universities budget happened to be under fire in Parliament. The Minister of Instruction had proposed general increases in professorial salaries; and this evoked widespread and candid popular criticism. The newspapers, from Turin to Rome,

were full of editorials and letters contributing facts which tended to show that already the courses of too many professors were abbreviated and minimized far below the nominal schedule. There was proof enough that some professors in the universities of Italy gave only one course during the year, with only one or two lectures a week, and that they began these courses late in November and ended them in March or April. In other words, the sapiential function of the university—that of furnishing maintenance for scholars while in the pursuit of science and learning—was being over-emphasized at the expense of the pedagogic function.

In this country, on the other hand, the opposite excess has been the fault. Developing upwards from the academy and the college, our university is still hampered by the traditions of pedagogy. The university term of nine full months is longer than that of any country in the civilized world. The hours of class room instruction—twelve to twenty hours per week are scarcely less than those of the non-research institutions,—the primary and secondary schools. The pedagogic function is still over-cultivated, at the expense of the sapiential function, which is starved.

We were beginning to restore something like the proper balance. But before we had anywhere nearly reached it, up sprang the summer school (within the last ten years), and is now checking and throttling our proper tendency to improvement. Instead of reducing our weekly average of fifteen lecture hours, and our term-lengths of nine months, we have proceeded to add to the scholar's yearly pedagogical task two of the three summer months.

The summer school is spreading, so that by contagion it threatens to become universal. And the instructors are in large part the same persons who teach during regular terms. Statistics are not yet available; that is one of the things that a committee should first inquire into. But, from observation of schools casually within range, my estimate is that about four-fifths of a faculty often accept places in the summer school, either of their own or another institution.

Now, my object in calling attention to the subject is to warn the profession of the *alarming danger to American research* as a whole. This country has an eclectic talent which fits it to become the leading community of the world in science and learning. But every community will achieve—as the world's history shows—in any branch of intellectual activity, only in proportion to the total amount of national time and energy expended in that branch. And yet, with our capabilities of destiny, we are deliberately crippling ourselves by cutting out a large part of the year's time for research, and the best and most natural part. If we were not already so behind the rest of the world in the University's sapiential function, the case would be bad enough. But with long terms and long week-schedules, we now proceed to the folly of chaining up our summer period!

The totals are the alarming feature. It is a simple matter of figures. Suppose any hundred scholars in our faculties: suppose that only fifty teach in summer; from this fifty deduct ten who would not in any event have pursued research; this leaves forty who have lost the special opportunities of summer. What are those opportunities? Deduct one month for pure holiday; this leaves two months lost. My own experience has been that in vacation months the quantity of uninterrupted time for research, as compared with term months, is as three to one; *i. e.* two months of vacation equals six months of term time. Figure seven months (deducting examination periods, etc.) as the available number of term months. Thus the equation becomes:

Year of Winter school alone = 13 units of research time;

All-the-year-round school = 9 units of research time.

In other words, nearly one-third of research-time is lost to our scholarship by the addition of the summer school. And if (as above estimated) some 40 per cent of our scholars are occupied in summer school, the total loss to American research annually is some 13 per cent or one-eighth. In the world's arena of achievement, this is a serious loss.

I am not here asking for the abandonment of the summer

school. Of course there are some good reasons for its existence. But I am insisting that the debit item to be charged against it is alarming. It is our duty to reconsider the whole situation in the light of this item, and to endeavor to eliminate it. Maybe the price is too high to pay for the benefits of the summer school. Maybe the benefits can be kept without paying that price. At any rate, the situation has been allowed to drift, and we must do so no longer. At present the university authorities are, on the whole, in the position of allowing the summer school to become a means of a much-needed increase of salaries, instead of supplying that increase by sounder methods. It is conceivable, from the individual point of view and that of *res angusta domi*, that the summer school should be an opportunity not justifiably to be resisted. But it is not conceivable that the salary-fixing authorities should, when the danger is once made plain to them, be satisfied to refrain from increasing salaries by some other method, more direct and less fraught with danger to the future of American scholarship.

I, therefore, urge that a committee be appointed to report on Summer School Organization.

I now close this survey of the work of the Association for the past year. In offering these personal views upon its various activities, I have aimed merely to stimulate reflection by our members upon these weighty problems, and to elicit those views, whether concordant or discordant, which will ultimately focus at our Annual Meeting as the decisive professional verdict.

May that verdict be a finding of truth and a judgment which shall prevail!

REPORT OF COMMITTEE N ON THE PREPARATION OF A HANDBOOK OF AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

The statement concerning the scope of the work of the committee prepared by the President of the Association is as follows:

This country greatly needs such a handbook. A small part of the data can be found in the annual report of the U. S. Commissioner of Education, in the American Year-Book, and elsewhere. But what is needed is a special publication, annually revised, on the general plan of the German "Minerva."

The reasons why the "Minerva" does not suffice are: (1) It is in German, and as a matter of self-respect, we ought to have one of our own in English, for the United States alone. (2) The present convulsion in Europe will result in numerous gaps in "Minerva," if, indeed, it is not abandoned; for five or ten years to come, it can hardly be complete and will decline in vogue; and it has never been up to date for the United States. (3) More important, "Minerva's" general plan does not admit several classes of data which we ourselves constantly need to know for American institutions; *e. g.*, the courses given and not merely the names of the professors. (4) Most important, the large and increasing number of foreign students, from Japan, China, South America, and elsewhere, find us without any reference book containing the information and the general survey which they need.

The handbook should presumably be, like "Minerva," a mere rehearsal of the principal classes of facts, obtainable of record; and would become a reference volume in every library, high school and editorial office in the country.

In view of the wide dispersal of the members of the committee it has not held a meeting and the proceedings have been conducted by correspondence. The committee was at first evenly divided on the desirability of taking up the preparation of the proposed handbook, but after discussion with the chairman one of the members agreed to reconsider his letter, and the vote was six to four in favor of proceeding

with the handbook in case suitable arrangements could be made.

Among the arguments against publication were:

(1) Such an annual reference book is not needed, "Minerva" and other books and the catalogues of universities supplying the information in a satisfactory way.

(2) If such a handbook were published it should be prepared by a committee of college registrars or some similar body. Professors should have their time conserved for teaching and research, not diverted to clerical and executive work. It is particularly wasteful of valuable time for such work to be undertaken by a widely separated committee having diverse views. It would be difficult to select the institutions to be included and the information to be given. There would be misunderstandings and jealousies that might injure the Association.

(3) The publication is not feasible on a commercial basis.

Among arguments in favor of publication were:

(1) The publication of "Minerva" may be suspended and it does not in any case give the information needed concerning American Institutions. It would be a saving of time and money to collate in one volume the information from many catalogues. The work would be a valuable address book of university and college officers.

(2) The publication under the auspices of the Association would add to the prestige of the book and of the Association. Information might be given in an objective way which would tend to improve the institutions and the status of the professor, such as emphasis on advanced work, opportunities for research, library facilities, salaries, tenure of office, participation of the faculty in university control and the like.

(3) The book might ultimately become self-supporting and even profitable, or it might be published through the Bureau of Education or some other agency.

Letters were addressed to five of the leading publishers of educational books, explaining the plan of the handbook and asking whether they cared to consider its publication. Messrs. Ginn and Company, Henry Holt and Company and Charles Scribner's Sons replied that they did not wish to consider it.

The Macmillan Company replied that they were interested, but they are not prepared to take the financial risk. Messrs. D. Appleton and Company wrote that they would like to consider the publication and there have been two interviews with the president of the company. They were willing to pay the cost of printing and to allow one-half the profits (if any) up to \$1500 towards the cost of compilation.

Correspondence was also conducted with A. N. Marquis and Co. (publishers of "Who's Who") and with Porter E. Sargent (publisher of a Handbook of Private Schools) but without promising results.

Correspondence was further conducted with Dr. P. P. Claxton, U. S. Commissioner of Education, and Dr. S. P. Capen, specialist in higher education in the Bureau of Education, and interviews were held with them. Dr. Claxton finally wrote:

After some days' consideration, I have reluctantly come to the conclusion that the compilation of such a volume even at three year intervals, with the present available force of the Bureau of Education, would be impossible. It may be that the Bureau will receive from the next Congress additional appropriations which could be used for work in higher education. Indeed, I am not without hope that this will come to pass. Nevertheless, it can not be counted upon.

I think the plan of the handbook as you outlined it to me in our recent conference and as it has been further commented upon by Dr. Capen, is admirable. I hope that the Association's committee will proceed to put it into execution, and I shall be glad to assist the committee in any way possible. I believe that the Bureau will be able to publish the document as a report of your committee, of course with the usual proviso, that the document meets our approval when it is submitted.

It thus appears that Messrs. D. Appleton and Co. or the Bureau of Education would publish the work if the manuscript is prepared by the Association. It would, however, be necessary for the editors to serve without compensation and for the Association to pay the cost of compilation, with

a possible partial return in the case of Messrs. D. Appleton and Co.

In view of all the circumstances of the case the committee unanimously makes the following recommendations:

(1) While from many points of view the publication of a Year-Book of American Universities would be desirable, we regard it as not feasible at the present time for the American Association of University Professors to undertake the editorial and financial responsibility.

(2) We recommend that in compiling the membership list of the Association there be inserted after each institution in which there are members, a statement concerning the institution, containing information of special interest to members. Such a publication might ultimately develop into a Year-Book of American Universities and Colleges.

Signed: J. McKEEN CATTELL, *Chairman*

THOMAS M. BALLIET

CHARLES BASKERVILLE

CARROLL W. DOTEN

THOMAS S. FISKE

JAMES W. GARNER

ARTHUR L. KIMBALL*

ALFRED C. LANE

WM. T. MAGRUDER

EDWIN BIDWELL WILSON

*I approve of the whole report with exception of the final recommendation. I do not see how a statement as brief as the circumstances would require could be made of enough value to pay for the editorial time and attention required, not to mention the increase that it would involve in the cost of the membership list. But I am ready to be converted if it can be shown that really useful data could in that way, in a few lines, be given to the members.—ARTHUR L. KIMBALL.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE P ON PENSIONS AND INSURANCE

In March, 1916, President Pritchett of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching submitted to the teachers and the presidents of educational institutions associated with the Foundation a report entitled "Comprehensive Plan of Insurance and Annuities for College Teachers." Teachers in associated institutions were invited to submit suggestions and criticisms with respect to the proposed plan, and the report itself asked the coöperation of every teacher and president in the associated institutions in determining the question "whether the fundamental principles set forth in the report are those upon which sound pension administration and legislation must rest." This invitation, as well as the fact that the report proposes radical changes in the relationship existing between the Foundation on the one hand and the associated institutions on the other, vitally affecting all university teachers in the United States, led to the appointment of this Committee on Pensions and Insurance to investigate and report upon the proposals contained in President Pritchett's report.

Without attempting to state in detail the comprehensive plan of insurance and annuities for college teachers, it may be said briefly that in substance the plan proposes:

(a) The abandonment of the plan adopted by the Foundation ten years ago of providing for teachers in accepted institutions a retiring allowance to be paid during life, following the age of retirement, which is now fixed by the rules of the Foundation at a minimum of 65 years. The suggestion is made that since the adoption of the existing plan has created to some extent the just expectation of a retiring allowance on the part of teachers in accepted institutions, this expectation will be fully met in the case of all teachers in accepted institutions who are over 45 years of age, but that teachers under that age may profitably transfer to the proposed plan of insurance and annuities; and there is an inti-

mation that this transfer may be made by action of the Foundation, without the prior assent of the individuals affected.

(b) The substitution for the existing plan of the proposed comprehensive plan for insurance of college teachers, which in substance is a plan for insurance for college teachers until age 65, combined with the payment of annuities to teachers after age 65, or to their widows in the event of their death after reaching that age.

(c) The establishment of a plan for the payment of disability allowances, defined as follows: "In case of a teacher holding a contract for insurance and annuity, whose health completely fails after a service of 15 years as professor, or 20 years as professor and instructor, the Foundation would at its own cost continue to pay during the period of his disability the premiums on his life insurance policy and also a minimum pension of \$1200 a year."

It is proposed that the cost of insurance and annuities be borne one-half by the teachers themselves and one-half by the educational institutions to which the teacher is attached, and that the benefits of the plan be extended generally to teachers in institutions of higher learning in the United States and Canada.

The contribution of the Carnegie Foundation to the proposed plan is the cost of administration of the plan, provided the surplus from insurance and annuity funds is proved insufficient for that purpose, and the guarantee of an interest return upon all invested insurance and annuity reserve funds of $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent per annum; and it is suggested that the Foundation may bear the cost of the disability allowance as above suggested.

I.

It will be observed that the essential element in the proposed change of plan is the transfer of the financial burden of making provision for members of the teaching profession, whether by pension or otherwise, from the Foundation to the teachers themselves and to the institutions with which

they are associated, and that so far as the Foundation itself makes any contribution to the proposed comprehensive plan, that contribution is to be spread out over so large an area as to make the benefits which it offers to any individual so slight as to be almost negligible.

President Pritchett's report makes it plain that the Carnegie Foundation has not sufficient financial resources to enable it to carry indefinitely the burden of the system which it has established. Under ordinary conditions, this might be deemed a sufficient reason for abandoning the existing plan and make it unnecessary to discuss the other reasons suggested in the report for proposing such action. It appears from the report, however, that the *Carnegie Corporation* an institution quite distant from the Carnegie Foundation has abundant funds which may be used for maintaining the existing system, although it is not bound to make such use of them. Since, therefore, abandonment of the plan may not be a financial necessity, and as the other reasons urged for its abandonment raise questions which are fundamental in the consideration of any plan for the financial benefit of the teaching profession other than by direct payment of salary, it is desirable that we should comment upon them very briefly.

On page 54 of President Pritchett's report he states in summary form his reason for believing that the existing pension system should be abandoned, as follows: "The fundamental defect in the existing pension system lies in the assumption that free pensions for college teachers would be permanently justified. In the light of ten years of experience and in the light of the experience of European pension systems, this assumption seems to rest upon a defective social philosophy. No permanent advantage will accrue to any calling or any profession by lifting from the shoulders of its members a load which under moral and economic laws they ought to bear."

It is to be noted that in reaching this conclusion emphasis is placed on the argument that it is the "free" pension which

is based on a defective social philosophy, for elsewhere in his report (page 12) President Pritchett reaches the conclusion that a pension system for the benefit of teachers is "demanded from the stand point of a just and humane social philosophy." He enumerates the reasons which may be urged for the establishment of a pension system for teachers as follows (pages 12, 13, 14):

1. The altruistic character of the teachers' profession.
2. The poverty of the teaching profession.
3. That a pension system is the only humane and feasible method by which aged and wornout teachers may be removed from the service.
4. The fact that college and university teachers as a class are separated from the usual commercial avenues of investment.
5. That college teachers constitute a group of employes in the economic sense, and that it is practicable to unite them for common protection.
6. That the maintenance of a pension system for college teachers has some effect in bringing able men into that calling.

While President Pritchett repudiates the first two of these reasons as offering any basis for a pension system, he accepts the others as justifying and requiring "the establishment and maintenance of a pension system for college teachers" (page 15).

While some of these reasons have at various times been advanced as a justification for the establishment of a pension system for college teachers, it may fairly be said that they do not singly or collectively state the reasons which were given, either by Mr. Carnegie or President Pritchett, upon the establishment of the Carnegie Foundation system of pensions ten years ago. The reason then urged for the establishment of the pension system was that by its establishment the cause of education would be aided by adding in substance to the remuneration of teachers in the form of a retiring allowance. And this allowance was established on the theory that, since it was in effect one form of remuneration, it was giving to the

teacher something that he was entitled to receive, thus adding to the dignity and security of the teaching profession and contributing to the cause of education.

Mr. Carnegie in his letter of April 16, 1905, in which he announced to the first Board of Trustees of the Foundation the purpose of his generous gift, opens with the sentence "I have reached the conclusion that the least rewarded of all the professions is that of the teacher in our higher educational institutions." President Pritchett in his First Report said (page 1) "It had for a long time prior to the establishment of this Foundation been evident that the time was approaching when, for the sake of education no less than of the teacher, the remuneration of the teacher's calling must be increased," and on page 2, "This gift to higher education was received with general approval. It was universally admitted that no wiser attempt could have been made to aid education than one that sought to deal in a wise and generous way with the question of the teacher's financial betterment." And on page 31,—referring to European experience it is said—"And inasmuch as the salaries of the teachers cannot be made equal to those of outside professions, this reward has come, in the main, by the establishment of a system of pensions to be paid to the professors themselves, to their widows and their orphans. In other words, the first and the largest ground for the establishment of systems of retiring pensions for teachers has been found in the wish to strengthen the profession of the teacher." On page 37, it is said "It is true that the real teacher finds in the joy of teaching his chief reward. The same thing is true of the highest class of men in any profession; but it is also true that as the rewards and the honors of a profession increase, it will become more attractive to men of ability, strength and initiative. In other words, the chief value of the establishment of a system of retiring allowances to the teacher in the higher institutions consists in the lifting of this uncertainty regarding old age or disability, in the consequent lightening of the load of anxiety, and in the increasing attractiveness of the pro-

fessor's life to an ambitious and enlightened man. All this tends to social dignity and stability." And in answer to the question "How this fund may be so used as . . . to strengthen the general interests of education?" President Pritchett says (page 37) "With regard to the second question, it is evident to the trustees that, to better the profession of the teacher and to attract into it increasing numbers of strong men, it is necessary that the retiring allowance should come as a matter of right, not as a charity. . . . It is essential in the opinion of the trustees that the fund shall be so administered as to appeal to the professors in American and Canadian colleges from the standpoint of a right, not from that of charity, to the end that the teacher shall receive his retiring allowance on exactly the same basis as that upon which he receives his active salary, as a part of his academic compensation.

"It is upon these two fundamental principles that the trustees and the Executive Committee have sought to build; and their whole effort has had for its aim the establishment in America, using that term in its widest sense, of the principle of the retiring allowance in institutions of higher learning, upon such a basis that it may come to the professor as a right, not a charity."

In the Second Annual Report of the Foundation, in a chapter entitled "The Carnegie Foundation, Not a Charity but an Educational Agency," it is stated (page 64) "that the retiring allowance must come as a right not as a charity; a thing earned in the regular course of service, not a charity."

It would be easy to multiply quotations from the annual reports of the Carnegie Foundation to show that the original conception of the pension plan adopted by the Foundation took very little account of the reasons which President Pritchett's report now states justify and require the establishment of a pension system—see "Comprehensive Plan of Insurance and Annuities" (page 15). Its principal aim clearly and repeatedly enunciated, was to promote the cause of education by increasing the security, the dignity and the

economic attractiveness of the scholar's calling, through the addition of certain forms of deferred salary to the teacher's eventual compensation. And this, so far as known to the teaching profession, has continued to be its aim until the publication of the "Comprehensive Plan for Insurance and Annuities for College Teachers."

The plan for retiring allowances thus conceived was put into operation. The teachers in accepted institutions and the educational world in general have accepted it in the spirit in which it was created. The Carnegie pension has not been regarded as a charity, the recipient of it has had no thought that he was receiving something for which he had given nothing. He has felt no embarrassment in receiving it, even though he might possess independent means.

It has remained for President Pritchett in 1916 to inform the recipients of the Carnegie pension that the pension is a "very gracious and noble charity" (page 54) and on page 56 of his report he states that the payment of a pension under such circumstances is an "embarrassing use of trust funds." This can be the case only when the original purposes of the pension system established by the Foundation are completely lost sight of.

If the Carnegie pension is a form of compensation, as it was intended to be at the time of its establishment, and as we believe President Pritchett establishes that it is or tends to become in his discussion of the topic "Are pensions wages" (page 34 of the report), then the only substantial social or economic question requiring to be answered in determining the desirability of the existing pension system is whether the American college teacher in receiving a Carnegie pension is receiving excessive compensation.

This was emphatically answered in the negative by the founder and by all those who were associated in the work of establishing the existing system, and we do not believe that the question is one which now merits serious debate or would receive any different answer if its consideration were dissociated from the immediate financial problem of the Foundation.

The fact that this compensation in the form of a pension is not received directly from the educational institution to which the teacher is attached does not appear to us to alter the case. The compensation of the teacher, whether paid by his college or university or by the Carnegie Foundation, has its ultimate source in benevolence, at least in the case of all institutions which do not receive state aid. A pension contributed to by the university whose only source of funds is private benevolence is a "*free*" pension to the same—but no greater—extent as if the contribution were made by the Carnegie Foundation or any other benevolent institution. The proposed change of plan, therefore, in so far as it shifts the burden of providing a pension allowance or annuity to the colleges or universities, does not appear to us to be based upon an essentially different social philosophy from that on which the existing system of Carnegie pensions is now based, and, in so far as it transfers the burden to the individual instructors, it appears to us to be in effect a reduction of the compensation to which they have heretofore justly regarded themselves as entitled, in the form of a pension "*as a right, not a charity.*"

We believe that the original conception of the pension system adopted by the Carnegie Foundation, as an aid to education through the increase of compensation to the teacher, was based upon sound social and economic principles. It would not have been essentially different in principle had the Carnegie Foundation made additions to the permanent endowment of the several accepted institutions for the purpose of increasing salaries, except that by effecting the increase through the medium of the pension it relieved its beneficiaries from the burden of investing the salary increase, a burden which as a class they are relatively unfitted to bear. Nor do we find in President Pritchett's report any convincing evidence that the existing pension system is based on a defective social philosophy, or that if continued it will not realize its purpose, or that it ought to be abandoned for any reason except inability to provide adequate funds for its maintenance.

If financial exigencies necessitate a modification of the existing plan so as to require coöperation and voluntary contribution to it by teachers, in order to ensure the continuance of its benefits, then we are of the opinion that the contribution by the Foundation should be so substantial that such benefits would not lose their present character as a means for improving the status of the profession by sensibly increasing the rewards that it offers; and that, so far as possible, the original aim and purpose of the Foundation should be adhered to.

II.

A suggestion made in President Pritchett's report which immediately concerns all of the teachers in accepted institutions is the proposal that teachers under 45 years of age should not be included in the benefits of the existing pension system. That the trustees of the Foundation clearly recognize that the Foundation is under moral obligation to the teachers in accepted institutions appears from their resolution of November 17, 1915, "That whatever plan is finally adopted will be devised with scrupulous regard to the privileges and expectations which have been created under existing rules" (page VIII). It becomes important at the outset, therefore, to inquire whether the proposed curtailing of those privileges and expectations is necessitated by financial inability to meet them, and if not, whether there is any moral justification for the discrimination against teachers in accepted institutions under 45 years of age. We were encouraged to believe that such necessity did not exist by the statement (page 81), "Mr. Carnegie has placed behind the institution he has founded [The Carnegie Foundation] a great corporation [The Carnegie Corporation] with an income far beyond the load which would be imposed by the present pension system."

In order, however, that a clear understanding might be reached on this point this committee, through its chairman, made inquiry of President Pritchett whether such necessity did in fact exist. To this inquiry President Pritchett has re-

plied, suggesting a gradual increase in the age of retirement from 65 to 68, and saying, "With this change in the rules the trustees may then fairly ask the Carnegie Corporation for its support in inaugurating the new system, and in maintaining the old one for all teachers now in the associated colleges, leaving to every teacher the option as to whether he would remain in the old system or enter the new." (Copies of the correspondence with President Pritchett are printed in an appendix.) While this does not answer definitely the inquiry whether there is financial necessity for excluding any teacher in an accepted institution, whatever his period of service, from the benefits of the existing system, we interpret President Pritchett's answer as an assurance that there are sufficient funds available, through the aid which the Carnegie Corporation may extend to the Carnegie Foundation, to meet the expectations of all teachers in accepted institutions, regardless of age, if such expectations are deemed to rest on a moral obligation of the Carnegie Foundation. If it should be found that the financial resources of the Foundation and the funds which may be availed of by it are insufficient for this purpose, then, of the various suggestions which have been made for reducing the benefits of the existing system, we regard a gradual change in the minimum age of retirement as perhaps least objectionable.*

That, however, such moral obligation exists is not, in our opinion, open to serious debate. It is the common observation of every man of experience in the teaching profession that the expectation of a retiring allowance is an important factor with many a teacher, not only in the choice of the profession, but, in many instances, in his choice of the institution in which he will practice that profession.

There are few men in administrative positions in our colleges and universities who cannot recall cases of young men

* This statement does not imply an approval of such a step, by the members of this committee, or the endorsement of any policy looking to an advance in the minimum age of retirement. Such proposal is not made in the comprehensive plan and is open to serious objections.

who have given up more lucrative professions to adopt the calling of the teacher, and have been influenced in doing so, in part at least, by the expectation that they would be entitled to the retiring allowance.

In the first annual report of the Foundation it was stated (page 37) that one of the principal ends to be realized by the pension system was the attraction of strong men into the teaching profession. In the report for 1912 (page 86) it was stated that the pension system "will have its influence in inducing men to remain permanently in the teaching profession," and in the present report, President Pritchett comments on the fact (page 34 and page 54) that the prospect of a pension is held out as an inducement to teachers to accept positions in associated institutions, and properly so, we may add, since, as we have already pointed out, the original conception of the pension system was that it was a form of additional compensation to the teacher.

Moreover, it is undoubtedly a fact that many teachers under 45 years of age have already made provision for life insurance of such character that it would be impossible for them to transfer to any other system without financial loss; while others, in expectation of the promised pensions, have failed to make provision for their old age, and can now make such provision, if at all, only by serious financial sacrifice. As President Pritchett points out in his report, "The man of 30 who looks forward over an interval of 35 years" to the acceptance of a pension "will pay for it in one way or another before he receives it." If pensions are wages, or if an instructor "at \$1500 a year who is offered \$1800 to go to another college is induced to remain where he is under the expectation of a pension 30 years later, not realizing that the difference in salary will pay for the pension several times over," then teachers in accepted institutions have been paying for their prospective pensions, of which it is now proposed they shall be deprived.

But the question of moral right is not one affecting individuals alone; it affects the accepted institutions. All of them

have consciously shaped their policy in relation to employment, compensation and retirement of teachers with definite reference to the pension system of the Carnegie Foundation. A number of them have abandoned or modified established pension systems of their own, as in the case of Columbia, Harvard and Yale, in reliance upon the pension system of the Carnegie Foundation which they have substituted for them. Others, in response to a definite offer of the Foundation to place them on its accepted list if they would comply with certain stipulated conditions, have made changes in their constitutions and in their denominational relations. Yet others, in return for the extension of the benefits of the pension system to them, undertook to provide retiring allowances for their teachers not eligible to the benefits of the Carnegie Foundation, and are now under moral, if not legal, obligations to make provision for the continuance of those benefits.

Thus it seems clear that the Carnegie Foundation is under moral obligations, not only to individuals, but to the institutions themselves, not to deprive teachers in the accepted institutions of their present expectancy of a pension. There is no middle ground for the compromise of moral obligations. We are therefore of the opinion that the Carnegie Foundation should not assume any new function until its present obligations both moral and legal are examined with precision, and provision made explicitly for meeting those obligations, and we believe that the Foundation is under the strongest moral obligation to include within the benefits of its existing pension system all teachers in accepted institutions, regardless of their age, to whom its present regulations were applicable in the academic year 1915-16.

III.

With reference to the proposed "Comprehensive Plan of Insurance and Annuities" we would say at the outset that we consider that the existing pension system of the Carnegie Foundation might properly be supplemented by some system of mutual insurance, with special provision for disability and

for teachers who are not of sound qualifications—that is of sub-standard physical qualifications—and for widows' allowances, the benefit of which system might well be extended to instructors in institutions not on the accepted list of the Foundation. Such a system should be mutual in character, so conducted that the beneficiaries of the plan would control its management and be entitled to participate in any surplus accumulation of insurance funds, and it should offer to all participants a definite contract. The existing pension system does not offer adequate protection against the risk of disability and it offers no protection for the risk of death before the completion of 25 years of service.

We believe that the Foundation could render a highly useful service to college and university teachers by the use of its organization in the collection of data and in assisting, in conjunction with representatives of the teaching profession, in the organization of such a plan of insurance, the cost of which should be defrayed from premiums paid by the insured. The members of the teaching profession undoubtedly constitute a group having common aims and experience such as make entirely feasible and desirable the establishment of such a plan of insurance. But we find ourselves unable at this time to approve of the proposed comprehensive plan of insurance and annuities, both because it is proposed as a substitute for a plan which we believe should not be abandoned in principle—because it does not itself contribute to the advancement of teaching—and also because we are not satisfied that the proposed plan is not open to serious objections, which should be subjected to systematic study and to the scrutiny of experts before it is finally adopted.

The past experience of the Foundation and its present financial embarrassment should serve as a warning of the perils involved in the laying out and putting into operation of an insurance plan for the payment of pensions and annuities extending over an indefinite period into the future and lacking in its statement many of the details on which must necessarily depend its success or failure. The members of

this committee have acquired from their recent experience a lively sense of the concern, not to say mental distress and financial loss, which may result from the failure or abandonment of such a plan after the great body of teachers have come to rely upon its protection.

We believe, therefore, that before the adoption of the proposed plan, or any plan which undertakes the establishment of a scheme of life and disability insurance and the payment of annuities to college teachers, additional data and detailed information should be available for study and criticism. No doubt such data have been gathered and considered by the Foundation, but before an invitation is accepted to participate in a plan involving the ultimate investment of a large sum of money by members of the teaching profession, and affecting vitally the future of college and university teachers throughout the country, we believe that a specific statement should be prepared and submitted by the Foundation showing its liabilities, accrued and prospective, under the existing plan, whether moral or legal. It will then be possible to ascertain definitely what financial resources are available, and therefore whether they are sufficient to ensure the success of the proposed plan of insurance and annuities or of any other plan which may be adopted involving participation by the Carnegie Foundation.

There should also be prepared and submitted a statement showing the prospective progress and details of operation of the proposed plan for insurance and annuities, as estimated in advance during a term of years, presumably at least for two generations. For this purpose the Foundation should prepare and present a schedule showing the estimated operations of the insurance company and the savings or annuity fund. It should show the number of lives, classified as to age, that are expected to participate in the plan at the present time, with the estimated increase in membership from year to year. It should show the income in the way of premiums, the expected or estimated contributions of various institutions and colleges, the interest income, the expected death claims, the

expense, and the annual amount which must be reserved to meet the reserve requirements of the New York insurance law. Such statement when prepared should be submitted to a committee or committees of representative teachers and of representatives of some recognized organization of actuaries, such as for example the Actuarial Society of America.

Then and only then will it be possible, we believe, to form an intelligent judgment as to the probable financial success of the plan and as to the real service which it is capable of rendering to the teaching profession. In order that adequate opportunity may be had for such study of the problem and the formation of such judgment, we are of the opinion that a period of at least one year is necessary, and we respectfully suggest that formal action with respect to this or any other plan of insurance and annuities for college teachers should be postponed at least one year from the date of the meeting of the trustees of the Foundation to be held on the 15th of November, 1916.

It also seems to the committee desirable, and it therefore requests, that opportunity be given to representatives of the American Association of University Professors to be present and to be heard at that meeting of the trustees. And in view of the importance of the subject and its far-reaching consequences to all university teachers in America, we venture to express the hope that no plan of insurance or annuities for university teachers will be adopted by the Foundation without further consultation with the Association.

We believe also that the consideration of this and other problems affecting the interests of university teachers would be facilitated and greater coöperation insured if the policy were adopted of electing university teachers to the Board of Trustees of the Carnegie Foundation from time to time as opportunity presents.

We think that a consideration of the details of the proposed plan at this time is of minor importance. Nevertheless it is desirable that we should direct attention to some of the numerous criticisms of it which appear to us to raise questions

which, so far as can be gathered from President Pritchett's report have not received adequate consideration. With respect to a number of these the committee expresses no opinion, for it has had neither the time nor the resources to enable it to make any thorough investigation of them. But if sufficient opportunity is afforded for the study of the details of the proposed plan of insurance and annuities, as we have already suggested, then we believe these criticisms should receive careful consideration. Among them may be mentioned the following:

(a) The proposed plan for insurance and annuities does not provide with sufficient definiteness for a plan of mutual participation, whereby the participants in the plan shall share in its management and in the accumulated surplus.

(b) The proposed disability benefit limits the payment of the benefit to professors who have been in service 15 years or more. In our opinion disability ought to be defined as disability from carrying on university service for any time during the period of service, and adequate provision made to insure against disability as thus defined. The consequences of the teacher's disability are usually much more serious during the earlier years of the period of service than in the later years.

(c) The difficulties of establishing a plan of insurance which would be compulsory for all participants have not received sufficient consideration. We are of the opinion that the compulsory feature of the plan is open to serious objection, and that it is doubtful whether it can be carried into practical operation. Among the objections which may be briefly enumerated are—that it restricts unduly the freedom of the individual teacher; that state universities and colleges would find themselves legally incompetent to contribute to a scheme for the benefit of teachers, and that an attempt to render them competent to do so through process of legislation would involve the entire vexed question of insurance for state employes; that the tendency would be to take from the teacher's salary the share contributed by the college toward his

insurance by deferring increases of salary; that teachers already carrying commercial insurance would be unwilling to give up such insurance; or to continue it with the added burden of compulsory insurance; and that many of those who have heretofore not taken commercial insurance would probably have valid reasons for declining to participate.

(d) The plan does not sufficiently disclose whether participants in it are to be subjected to a medical examination, and, if such examinations are to be made, it does not make adequate provision for those who are sub-standard risks. If no medical examination is to be required, it does not appear whether there are sufficient data available on which to base an estimate of the cost of this class of group insurance for long periods. In the absence of such data the acceptance of such risks would imperil the success of the plan.

(e) It has been urged by some that a plan for insurance of teachers could be devised and carried into effect with established insurance companies, eliminating agents' commissions, at a cost not substantially greater than the cost of insurance under the plan proposed, but with the added benefit of the experience, stability, and established organization of the better commercial insurance companies. Without expressing any final opinion upon this contention, we may say that it is not clear from President Pritchett's report what saving in cost of insurance is effected over the cost of insurance on a similar plan which might be effected with the commercial companies. Such information as we have been able to gather indicates that the difference in cost would be very slight, and that by carrying into effect the proposed plan the Carnegie Foundation would substitute for its former activities a venture into a field new to it, not free from business hazards, but long and successfully occupied by others, without any definite expectation of substantial financial advantage.

(f) The proposed plan does not make clear that there is any definite separation of the insurance from the annuity plan, and is in any case too rigid, and does not offer sufficient variety of types of insurance to be adaptable to the needs of university professors.

(g) Adequate consideration has not been given to the possibility of combining with the proposed savings fund a provision for decreasing term insurance so that as the savings fund increases the amount of insurance may decrease with consequent saving of its cost.

(h) No definite provision is made for the payment of dividends or other disposition of surplus accumulation under the proposed plan.

(i) Sufficient consideration has not been given to the position of one who withdraws from the teaching profession and wishes to continue his insurance upon a proper basis.

(j) No consideration has apparently been given to the relative age of professors and their wives and to its effect on the cost of the annuity.*

(k) No provision is made for enabling those who already have insurance to avail themselves advantageously of the benefits of the proposed plan.

The unfortunate financial history of the Foundation, the suggested change in its fundamental purpose under the guise of a change of rules relating to its administration, the defects and omissions in the proposed Comprehensive Plan of Insurance and the unconvincing character of the reasons which are urged for the change, have resulted in a loss of confidence in the Foundation on the part of American university teachers. No man enjoying a wide acquaintance with members of the profession can have any doubt of this fact. If evidence of it were needed, it may be found in the reports of various committees of university faculties, appointed to consider the Comprehensive Plan of Insurance and Annuities, such as for example, the reports of Cornell, Harvard, Princeton, Stanford University, the University of Wisconsin, and Johns Hopkins University. Such lack of confidence must inevitably impair the usefulness of the Foundation, and make it difficult, if not impossible, to solve satisfactorily the problems which are

* This objection has apparently been met in the non-confidential copy of President Pritchett's report which, however, was not in the hands of the committee at the time of preparing this report.

pressing for solution. We deem it of the highest importance that every effort should be made on the part of those interested in the promotion of the purposes of the Foundation to repair that loss. For the full realization of this end four things seem to us chiefly requisite. The first is the publication by the Foundation of a definite assurance that it will completely fulfill any expectations held out to teachers in the associated institutions by the present rules. The second is a strict adherence to the fundamental principles and purposes indicated by Mr. Carnegie in his letter of gift and repeatedly enunciated in the early public declarations of the Foundation, on the basis of which the existing system was established. The third is the encouragement of a more active and direct participation of the teaching profession in the management of the Foundation and in the consideration of questions which gravely affect the future of the profession and of the American universities and colleges. Finally it seems to us essential, if the Foundation is to enjoy the confidence of the academic profession and attain its highest usefulness, that it should be recognized that for it, even more than for other institutions, definiteness and steadiness of purpose and stability of policy are indispensable. It is our earnest hope that the future work of the Foundation with its potency for notable service to American education may be firmly based upon these principles.

The Committee:

- THOMAS S. ADAMS, Yale University.
- FRANCIS H. BOHLEN, University of Pennsylvania.
- WALTER W. COOK, Yale University.
- F. S. DEIBLER, Northwestern University.
- FRANK H. DIXON, Dartmouth College.
- THOMAS C. ESTY, Amherst College.
- W. F. GEPHART, Washington University.
- JOHN H. GRAY, University of Minnesota.
- HENRY B. GARDNER, Brown University.
- M. W. HASKELL, University of California.
- OTTO HELLER, Washington University.

JACOB H. HOLLANDER, Johns Hopkins University.
 S. S. HUEBNER, University of Pennsylvania.
 JOSEPH JASTROW, University of Wisconsin.
 E. W. KEMMERER, Princeton University.
 ALFRED C. LANE, Tufts College.
 ARTHUR O. LOVEJOY, Johns Hopkins University.
 H. A. MILLIS, University of Chicago.
 CARL C. PLEHN, University of California.
 H. L. RIETZ, University of Illinois.
 ASHLEY H. THORNDIKE, Columbia University.
 HENRY S. WHITE, Vassar College.
 W. F. WILLCOX, Cornell University.
 HARLAN F. STONE, *Chairman*, Columbia University.

APPENDIX

August 26, 1916.

PRESIDENT HENRY S. PRITCHETT,
 Carnegie Foundation,
 276 Fifth Avenue,
 New York City.

My dear President Pritchett:

There will be a meeting of the Committee of the American Association of University Professors on Pensions and Insurance in New York City some time in September at which time I hope to have in hand the material necessary for a thorough consideration and discussion of the report of the Foundation on the subject of pensions and insurance.

The passage in the report which has apparently caused most concern and discussion consists of the three sentences at the top of page XVIII (in the non-confidential issue). This has generally been construed as meaning that the administration of the Foundation is seriously considering a plan whereby

(a) Teachers under a certain age—the age of 45 being tentatively suggested—who are by the existing rules entitled to receive eventual retiring allowances, will fail to receive such allowances as the present rules specify; and whereby, also,

(b) Such teachers, unless they and their institutions qualify under the proposed new plan of contributory pensions, will be

deprived of any benefits whatever from the pension system of the Foundation.

It is, of course, important that our committee, before preparing its report, be sure whether this interpretation of the sentences mentioned is the correct one. I shall therefore be greatly obliged if you will inform me whether any plan which would thus nullify certain of the expectations naturally created by the present rules, is under consideration.

If such is the case, it would then seem important for our committee, and the profession at large, to know whether the Foundation's consideration of the step above referred to is due to a belief that the funds held and obtainable by the Foundation will prove insufficient for the payment of all the eventual claims of persons now having legitimate expectations of pensions, in now accepted institutions; or whether the contemplation of this step is due wholly to a change of view respecting the general social expediency of non-contributory pension systems. I recognize, of course, that both reasons may, in fact, have had weight. The opinion of our committee, however, may possibly depend a good deal upon whether—apart from all other considerations—a nullification of certain of the existing expectations appears to you to be unavoidable, upon purely financial grounds. I understand that, in any case, you regard it as financially impossible that the Foundation should continue to take on further obligations on the same scale in the future as in the past. My present inquiry does not refer to this point, but to the existence of a fiscal necessity for a modification of the rules which would affect teachers *already* in the faculties of the associated institutions.

If such necessity exists, it would, I think, interest our committee to know whether the administration of the Foundation has considered whether or not a general *pro rata* reduction of the scale of pensions might be more equitable and expedient than the complete exclusion of a certain class of teachers now in accepted institutions, by the imposition of an age limit,—which would necessarily be determined somewhat arbitrarily.

I ought, perhaps, to add that any information which you may be so good as to send me, in reply to these inquiries, will be regarded as intended for communication to the committee as a whole, and, through the committee, to the members of the Association.

Yours very truly,
HARLAN F. STONE.

JUNIPERO PLAZA, SANTA BARBARA, CAL.,

September 6, 1916.

My dear Dean Stone:

I am very glad to answer your inquiry of August 26 as fully as possible. My answer, however, carries no more than my own judgment. The trustees of the Foundation have not taken any action with respect to my report. It is their intention to make use of all opinions, such as for example that which will come from your committee. I can, however, give you my own judgment, and indicate the kind of recommendation I shall make.

We have now received from the teachers of the associated colleges a full expression of their opinion as to the relative desirability of the two plans. With few exceptions these teachers approve the following general principles:

I. A pension system should be a part of a comprehensive relief system. Many teachers consider the insurance benefit of greater importance to the teacher than the pension benefit.

II. The teachers prefer to pay their full share of the cost of any pension or relief system.

III. The contributory plan, with annual reserve set aside year by year, is recognized as permanent and financially sound.

IV. The reasonable expectations of teachers in the associated colleges should be regarded as a first obligation upon the resources of the Foundation.

Almost universally the teachers in the associated colleges raise the inquiry whether the present pensions will be discontinued at a definite date in the future, and if so, at what age. This is the *argumentum ad hominem* which is in every man's mind, and however teachers approve the general principles of the proposed pension plan for future generations, they prefer, almost without exception, to have their own pensions paid by the Carnegie Foundation, although it is to be said that these expressions come mainly from men well along in years. Outside the personal question involved, these men very naturally dislike the notion of a sharp line of division between teachers in these colleges. There is an evident feeling among the older men that they do not wish to be put in the position of security while their younger colleagues are omitted.

This is precisely the question raised by your letter, and I now proceed to answer your inquiry so far as it can be answered by me as president of the Foundation.

In recommending to the trustees the system which I last year presented I have approached the question entirely from the standpoint of what sort of relief system for teachers is needed, what is socially just and what is financially sound and enduring? I have left out of view the financial future of the Carnegie pensions altogether, for the reason that if the Carnegie Corporation deems it wise to carry on the present pension system indefinitely, the Corporation has the means to enable this to be done. I have conceived it to be my duty to approach the question from the standpoint of what is wise and feasible and permanent in pension systems. The determination how long the present pension system shall be continued is however a part of the whole question, and it is a part which involves most directly personal considerations and interests.

As to how this shall be decided various opinions are expressed in the letters of the teachers sent to the Foundation. An extreme view is that the Foundation is morally obligated to offer a retiring allowance upon the present basis to every teacher in the associated institutions. It is held that the youngest instructor, who last year entered any of these colleges, has a moral (if not a legal) claim to a pension a generation hence.

It is interesting to remember that ten years ago when the Foundation announced its pension plan, and reserved in specific terms the power to change these rules in the future in such manner as experience might show to be in the interest of the great body of teachers, some of these teachers sharply criticised the Foundation on the ground that it committed itself to nothing. A few teachers in universities which had already established pension systems were particularly strong in their protests because, as they held, the college systems which were displaced were of contractual nature, while the Carnegie pensions carried no guarantee.

It seems clear that the present system must not be terminated in a manner to bring hardship or inconvenience upon teachers whose plans for the future have been shaped to meet the benefits contemplated under the rules. It is, I think, equally clear that the claim that a young instructor just entered one of these colleges has a vested right in a pension 35 years hence is groundless. Such a claim would not be approved if submitted to a fair and unprejudiced tribunal.

My view is, however, that it is not wise or desirable to go into any detailed examination of what may be the exact measure of obligation which the Foundation has assumed as

to the expectations of these teachers. It is better to carry out a more than generous provision if it is possible to do so, rather than have any feeling of disappointment such as might be created by dividing the teachers of the associated colleges by an arbitrarily drawn line.

I have been led to the following conclusion as a just and fair settlement, in large measure by the suggestions of teachers themselves. I am also influenced, as must be the trustees of the Carnegie Foundation, by the fact that any plan for the long future involves the coöperation of the Carnegie Corporation. These trustees must consider their obligation to other causes, and to other institutions founded by Mr. Carnegie. It is therefore incumbent on the trustees of the Foundation in making their recommendation, to remember the obligations of the Corporation as well as their own obligations to teachers in the associated colleges.

In the letters sent to the Foundation relative to the two plans, there is a very general agreement that 65, the minimum age of retirement, is set too low. Army officers only retire at 64, and a teacher at 65, if in good health, ought to be at the maximum of his powers. Suggestions are made to raise this limit to as high as 70, to my thinking entirely too high a limit. There would, however, be general agreement that 68 is a fitting compromise, retaining of course the present arrangement which enables a teacher to retire five years earlier with the coöperation of his college. In order to make as little inconvenience as possible, 66 might serve as the retiring limit for a given period, 67 for a similar period and 68 thereafter.

With this change in the rules the trustees may then fairly ask the Carnegie Corporation for its support in inaugurating the new system, and in maintaining the old one for all teachers now in the associated colleges, leaving to every teacher the option as to whether he would remain in the old system or enter the new.

In considering this question I have tried to remember not only the teachers of the associated colleges and the responsibilities of the Carnegie Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation, but also to bear in mind the interests of the 25,000 college teachers outside the associated colleges. To them as yet we have no formal or legal obligation. But neither the trustees of the Foundation nor the American Association of University Professors will desire to leave their interests out of view. The situation is one calling for fair, unselfish and generous thinking from all those who deal with it.

I am very sincerely yours,
HENRY S. PRITCHETT.

NOMINATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP

The following one hundred forty-one applications are printed under the rules adopted by the Council in May. Under these rules, any candidate or nominee against whom no negative vote is received from a member of the Council within thirty days of publication is deemed to have been approved by the Council. Objection to any nominee may be addressed to the Secretary by any member. The names of the nominators follow the name of each candidate, in parenthesis. Nominators for whom no institution is specified are colleagues of the nominee.

- Romanzo Adams (Econom.), Nevada,
(G. H. True, California, M. S. Wildman, Stanford, J. M. Gillette, N. Dakota)
- Philip S. Allen (German), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, E. H. Moore, C. H. Beeson)
- Arthur Irving Andrews (Hist.), Tufts,
(A. C. Lane, H. V. Neal, H. C. Metcalf)
- Grace M. Bacon (German), Mt. Holyoke,
(M. Winkler, Michigan, J. L. Markley, Michigan, E. C. Hinsdale)
- Margaret Ball (English), Mt. Holyoke,
(E. B. Talbot, W. T. Brewster, Columbia, W. P. Trent, Columbia)
- Grove Ettinger Barber (Hist.), Nebraska,
(H. B. Alexander, L. E. Aylsworth, H. K. Wolfe)
- Harlan H. Barrows (Geog.), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, E. H. Moore, C. H. Beeson)
- A. H. Baxter (Rom. Lang.), Amherst,
(H. C. Lancaster, J. W. Crook, R. G. Gettell)
- Robert Russel Bensley (Anat.), Chicago,
(E. H. Moore, H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson)
- Elbert Jay Benton (Hist.), Western Reserve,
(O. F. Emerson, S. B. Platner, C. C. Arbuthnot)
- Frank Billings (Medicine), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson, E. H. Moore)
- Robert Johnson Bonner (Greek), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson, E. H. Moore)
- Joseph Leopold Borgerhoff (Rom. Lang.), Western Reserve,
(W. H. Hulme, H. A. Aikins, H. P. Cushing)
- Percy Holmes Boynton (English), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson, E. H. Moore)
- Roger F. Brunel (Chem.), Bryn Mawr,
(W. B. Huff, G. A. Barton, W. R. Smith)
- Carl Darling Buck (Philol.), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson, E. H. Moore)

82 AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

- Nathaniel Butler (Educ.), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson, E. H. Moore)
- Otis William Caldwell (Botany), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson, E. H. Moore)
- Anton Julius Carlson (Physiol.), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson, E. H. Moore)
- Emma Perry Carr (Chem.), Mt. Holyoke,
(J. Stieglitz, Chicago, A. J. Hopkins, Amherst, E. R. Laird)
- Charles Joseph Chamberlain (Botany), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson, E. H. Moore)
- George Gailey Chambers (Math.), Pennsylvania,
(W. B. McDaniel, J. C. Rolfe, R. G. Kent)
- Winthrop Holt Chenery (Rom. Lang.), Washington (St. Louis),
(E. J. Swift, J. L. Lowes, W. F. Gephart)
- Arthur Houston Chivers (Biol.), Dartmouth,
(W. Patten, H. D. Foster, F. P. Emery)
- Solomon Henry Clark (Public Speaking), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson, E. H. Moore)
- Joseph G. Coffin (Physics), College of the City of New York,
(C. Baskerville, S. P. Duggan, L. F. Mott)
- Charles Edward Cory (Philos.), Washington (St. Louis),
(J. L. Lowes, W. F. Gephart, Otto Heller)
- Henry Chandler Cowles (Plant Ecology), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson, E. H. Moore)
- James Elbert Cutter (Sociol.), Western Reserve,
(B. P. Bourland, O. F. Emerson, H. P. Cushing)
- William J. Davidson (Religious Education), Northwestern,
(F. C. Eiselen, T. F. Holgate, J. H. Wigmore)
- William Kendall Denison (Latin), Tufts,
(H. C. Metcalf, H. V. Neal, A. C. Lane)
- H. W. Doughty (Chem.), Amherst,
(H. C. Lancaster, J. W. Crook, R. G. Gettell)
- Otto Dunkel (Math.), Washington (St. Louis),
(J. L. Lowes, W. F. Gephart, Otto Heller)
- Frank Edgar Farley (English), Simmons,
(L. L. Campbell, G. L. Kittredge, Harvard, W. H. Schofield, Harvard)
- Clarence Errol Ferree (Psychol.), Bryn Mawr,
(T. de Laguna, G. A. Barton, W. R. Smith)
- Mary Louise Fossler (Chem.), Nebraska,
(E. W. Davis, M. M. Fogg, G. D. Swezey)
- George Burnham Foster (Philosophy of Religion), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson, E. H. Moore)
- James Alfred Field (Econom.), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson, E. H. Moore)
- Edith Foster Flint (English), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson, E. H. Moore)
- Henry Gordon Gale (Physics), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson, E. H. Moore)

- H. P. Gallinger (Hist.), Amherst,
(H. C. Lancaster, J. W. Crook, R. G. Gettell)
- Caroline Morris Galt (Archaeology), Mt. Holyoke,
(H. M. Searles, N. G. McCrea, Columbia, M. N. Wetmore, Williams)
- John H. Gerould (Biol.), Dartmouth,
(W. Patten, H. D. Foster, E. B. Woods)
- A. J. Goldfarb (Biol.), College of the City of New York,
(C. Baskerville, S. P. Duggan, L. F. Mott)
- James Walter Goldthwaite (Geol.), Dartmouth,
(H. D. Foster, F. P. Emery, C. H. Page)
- John Paul Goode (Geog.), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson, E. H. Moore)
- Reginald R. Goodell (Rom. Lang.), Simmons,
(L. L. Campbell, H. W. Tyler, M. I. T., C. W. Doten, M. I. T.)
- Charles H. Gray (English), Tufts,
(H. V. Neal, A. C. Lane, G. C. Anthony)
- Ernest Roy Greene (Rom. Lang.), Dartmouth,
(P. O. Skinner, W. K. Stewart, W. H. Sheldon)
- Jesse M. Greenman (Botany), Washington (St. Louis),
(G. T. Moore, E. J. Swift, F. W. Shipley)
- Hippolyte Gruener (Chem.), Western Reserve,
(H. P. Cushing, O. F. Emerson, S. B. Platner)
- Oliver E. Glenn (Math.), Pennsylvania,
(W. B. McDaniel, J. C. Rolfe, R. G. Kent)
- Winfield Scott Hall (Physiol.), Northwestern,
(J. H. Long, H. M. Gordin, G. P. Costigan, Jr.)
- George H. Hallett (Math.), Pennsylvania,
(W. B. McDaniel, J. C. Rolfe, R. G. Kent)
- William Draper Harkins (Chem.), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson, E. H. Moore)
- Charles Harris (German), Western Reserve,
(O. F. Emerson, C. C. Arbuthnot, S. B. Platner)
- S. P. Hayes (Psychol.), Mt. Holyoke,
(E. B. Talbot, F. B. Loomis, Amherst, T. F. Collier, Brown)
- Francis H. Herrick (Biol.), Western Reserve,
(H. P. Cushing, S. B. Platner, O. F. Emerson)
- George Carter Howland (Literature), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson, E. H. Moore)
- George Oscar James (Astron.), Washington (St. Louis),
(A. S. Langsdorf, E. J. Swift, J. L. Lowes)
- William W. Keysor (Law), Washington (St. Louis),
(A. S. Langsdorf, E. J. Swift, W. F. Gephart)
- Gordon Jennings Laing (Latin), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson, E. H. Moore)
- Kurt Laves (Astron.), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, E. H. Moore, C. H. Beeson)
- James W. Linn (English), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson, E. H. Moore)

- Leo Loeb (Pathology), Washington (St. Louis),
(E. J. Swift, W. F. Gephart, G. Douay)
- Robert Morss Lovett (English), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson, E. H. Moore)
- Rollo LaVerne Lyman (English), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, E. H. Moore, C. H. Beeson)
- Walter Edward McCourt (Geol.), Washington (St. Louis),
(J. L. Lowes, F. W. Shipley, Otto Heller)
- William Darnall MacClintock (English), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson, E. H. Moore)
- Hugh McGuigan (Pharmacology), Northwestern,
(J. H. Long, H. M. Gordin, G. P. Costigan, Jr.)
- William Roy Mackenzie (English), Washington (St. Louis),
(G. T. Moore, E. J. Swift, J. L. Lowes)
- Andrew Cunningham McLaughlin (Hist.), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson, E. H. Moore)
- Le Roy McMaster (Chem.), Washington (St. Louis),
(C. A. Waldo, W. F. Gephart, Otto Heller)
- John Mathews Manly (English), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson, E. H. Moore)
- O. Manthey-Zorn (German), Amherst,
(H. C. Lancaster, J. W. Crook, R. G. Gettell)
- Leon Carroll Marshall (Econom.), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson, E. H. Moore)
- Emilie Norton Martin (Math.), Mt. Holyoke,
(C. A. Scott, Bryn Mawr, T. C. Esty, Amherst, E. R. Laird)
- Albert Prescott Mathews (Chem.), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson, E. H. Moore)
- Shailer Mathews (Theology), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson, E. H. Moore)
- Charles E. Merriam (Pol. Sci.), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, E. H. Moore, C. H. Beeson)
- Frank Justus Miller (Latin), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson, E. H. Moore)
- Robert A. Millikan (Physics), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, E. H. Moore, C. H. Beeson)
- Herbert R. Moody (Chem.), College of the City of New York,
(C. Baskerville, S. P. Duggan, L. F. Mott)
- Richard Green Moulton (Literature), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson, E. H. Moore)
- George William Meyers (Math.), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson, E. H. Moore)
- Horatio Hackett Newman (Zool.), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson, E. H. Moore)
- W. J. Newlin (Philos.), Amherst,
(H. C. Lancaster, J. W. Crook, R. G. Gettell)
- Ernest Linwood Ohle (Mech. Eng.), Washington (St. Louis),
(G. T. Moore, A. S. Langsdorf, F. W. Shipley)

- Elizabeth H. Palmer (Latin), Vassar,
(E. D. Fite, H. S. White, J. L. Moore)
- E. M. Patterson (Econom.), Pennsylvania,
(W. B. McDaniel, J. C. Rolfe, R. G. Kent)
- Lindley Pyle (Physics), Washington (St. Louis),
(C. A. Waldo, W. F. Gephart, Otto Heller)
- Stephen Walter Ranson (Anat.), Northwestern,
(J. H. Long, H. M. Gordin, G. P. Costigan, Jr.)
- Frederick G. Reynolds (Math.), College of the City of New York,
(C. Baskerville, S. P. Duggan, L. F. Mott)
- Myra Reynolds (English), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, E. H. Moore, C. H. Beeson)
- David Allan Robertson (English), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson, E. H. Moore)
- Edward H. Rockwell (Struct. Eng.), Tufts,
(H. V. Neal, H. C. Metcalf, A. C. Lane)
- William Henry Roever (Math.), Washington (St. Louis),
(C. A. Waldo, A. S. Langsdorf, E. J. Swift)
- Rollin D. Salisbury (Geog.), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson, E. H. Moore)
- Frank B. Sanborn (Civil Eng.), Tufts,
(H. V. Neal, H. C. Metcalf, A. C. Lane)
- Catharine Saunders (Latin), Vassar,
(E. D. Fite, J. L. Moore, H. S. White)
- Henry N. Sanders (Greek), Bryn Mawr,
(A. L. Wheeler, W. R. Smith, G. A. Barton)
- Ferdinand Schevill (Hist.), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson, E. H. Moore)
- Karl Schmidt (Philos.), Tufts,
(H. V. Neal, H. C. Metcalf, A. C. Lane)
- Philipp Seiberth (German), Washington (St. Louis),
(J. L. Lowes, G. Douay, Otto Heller)
- Arthur R. Seymour (Rom. Lang.), Illinois,
(L. S. Rowe, Pennsylvania, T. E. Oliver, J. Goebel)
- Lewis Piaget Shanks (Rom. Lang.), Pennsylvania,
(J. C. Rolfe, W. B. McDaniel, R. G. Kent)
- P. V. D. Shelly (English), Pennsylvania,
(W. B. McDaniel, J. C. Rolfe, R. G. Kent)
- Francis Wayland Shepardson (Hist.), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson, E. H. Moore)
- Theodore Gerald Soares (Theology), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson, E. H. Moore)
- H. W. Springsteen (Physics), Western Reserve,
(H. P. Cushing, B. P. Bourland, O. F. Emerson)
- Gerald Birney Smith (Theology), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson, E. H. Moore)
- Holmes Smith (Art), Washington (St. Louis),
(A. S. Langsdorf, E. J. Swift, F. W. Shipley)

- Marion P. Smith (Econom.), Bryn Mawr,
(G. A. Barton, A. L. Wheeler, W. B. Huff)
- Franklyn Bliss Snyder (English), Northwestern,
(U. S. Grant, W. E. Hotchkiss, J. H. Wigmore)
- Clara F. Stevens (English), Mt. Holyoke,
(John Dewey, Columbia, F. N. Scott, Michigan, E. C. Hinsdale)
- Thomas A. Storey (Hygiene), College of the City of New York,
(C. Baskerville, S. P. Duggan, L. F. Mott)
- Ernest Osgood Sweetser (Civil Eng.), Washington (St. Louis),
(A. S. Langsdorf, Otto Heller, J. L. Lowes)
- Frank Bigelow Tarbell (Archaeology), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson, E. H. Moore)
- Benjamin Terry (Hist.), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson, E. H. Moore)
- Robert J. Terry (Medicine), Washington (St. Louis),
(G. T. Moore, E. J. Swift, W. F. Gephart)
- Ida C. Thallon (Hist.), Vassar,
(J. L. Moore, E. D. Fite, H. S. White)
- F. L. Thompson (Hist.), Amherst,
(H. C. Lancaster, J. W. Crook, R. G. Gettell)
- J. A. Thompson (Physics), Amherst,
(H. C. Lancaster, J. W. Crook, R. G. Gettell)
- James Westfall Thompson (Hist.), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson, E. H. Moore)
- George Reeves Throop (Latin and Greek), Washington (St. Louis),
(F. W. Shipley, G. Douay, Otto Heller)
- Albert Harris Tolman (English), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson, E. H. Moore)
- Olin F. Tower (Chem.), Western Reserve,
(B. P. Bourland, S. B. Platner, O. F. Emerson)
- Abby Howe Turner (Physiol.), Mt. Holyoke,
(E. B. Talbot, F. B. Loomis, Amherst, H. W. Tyler, M. I. T.)
- J. M. Tyler (Biol.), Amherst,
(H. C. Lancaster, J. W. Crook, R. G. Gettell)
- R. P. Utter (English), Amherst,
(H. C. Lancaster, J. W. Crook, R. G. Gettell)
- Herbert H. Vaughan (Rom. Lang.), Pennsylvania,
(J. C. Rolfe, W. B. McDaniel, R. G. Kent)
- Elda R. Walker (Botany), Nebraska,
(H. B. Alexander, G. E. Howard, H. K. Wolfe)
- Elizabeth Wallace (French), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson, E. H. Moore)
- Stuart Weller (Geol.), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson, E. H. Moore)
- Frank P. Whitman (Physics), Western Reserve,
(H. P. Cushing, O. F. Emerson, S. B. Platner)
- Ernest Hatch Wilkins (Rom. Lang.), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaught, C. H. Beeson, E. H. Moore)

Herbert L. Willett (Semitic Lang.), Chicago,
(H. E. Slaughter, E. H. Moore, C. H. Beeson)

Mary Gilmore Williams (Greek), Mt. Holyoke,
(F. W. Kelsey, Michigan, J. H. Drake, Michigan, E. R. Laird)

Wilmer C. Wright (Greek), Bryn Mawr,
(A. L. Wheeler, W. R. Smith, G. A. Barton)

Stark Young (English), Amherst,
(H. C. Lancaster, J. W. Crook, R. G. Gettell)

Frederick Robert Zeit (Pathology), Northwestern,
(J. H. Long, H. M. Gordin, G. P. Costigan, Jr.)